LEVEL ONE

THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

April, 1920 Vol. 7 No. 2

Editorial Comment - - - - 99
Independents in Politics and Religion.—The Search for God.—Are Broad Churchmen Narrow?—The Episcopal Church and Papalism.—An Approach Towards What?

The Present Position of Spiritualism - - 109
G. C. Rawlinson

A Renewal of Faith - - - - 118
Bernard Iddings Bell

The Interchurch World Movement - - 130
Frederic B. Hodgins

The Concordat and After - - - 138
William Whiting Davis

The Eucharist as a Memorial of the Resurrection 147
H. C. Ackerman

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians - - 160
Fleming James

Book Reviews - - - - - 187

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under Act of March 3, 1879

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 42 Albany Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
OFFICES: 42 ALBANY STREET, NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

BROAD CHURCH THEOLOGY

Its Limitations and Defects

By W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D.

Cloth, $1.35. Postage additional.

With this volume there is initiated the SECOND SERIES *of*

Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice

The volume is intended as a serious appraisal of "Broad Church Theology," as known in England, and as interpreted in its own literature. Acknowledging the difficulty of assuming that what one man writes is necessarily to be accepted as representative of a whole school of thought in which "freedom and liberty" are "constant watchwords" and of which "the bugbear is authority," Dr. Simpson yet gathers from the representative literature of the school a sufficient amount of unity to enable him to comment upon positions assumed generally by the writers. After his introduction he treats of his subject in the following named chapters: Can God be Known at all? Can we Rightly Call God Personal? The Historic Origin of the Doctrine of the Trinity; Substitutes for the Trinitarian Conception; The Trinitarian Conception and Psychology; The Faith of the Church Concerning God; The Modernist Interpretation of Christ; The Apostolic Doctrine of Christ's Preëxistence; Christ's Preëxistence and its Importance to Religion; Humility based on the Example of the Preëxisting Christ; Generosity based on the Example of the Preexisting Christ.

In fact the book is a careful refutation of Modernist attacks upon Catholic theology, and the only volume of the sort that has been issued in recent years.

Morehouse Publishing Co. 1801-11 Fond du Lac Ave. Milwaukee, Wis.

JUST READY

THE HOLY EUCHARIST

ADDRESSES AT BENEDICTION

By the REV. J. G. H. BARRY, D.D.

An Exposition of Eucharistic Worship and Practice

238 Pages. Library Binding.

$1.50

CONTENTS

1. How Doctrine Grows. 2. Growth in Eucharistic Doctrine. 3. Obstacles to the Reception of Holy Communion. 4. Preparation for Communion. 5. Frequent Communion. 6. Members One of Another. 7. The Real Presence. 8. The Sacrifice of Spiritual Communion. 10. The Fruits of Communion. 11. Thanksgiving. 12. Visits to the Blessed Sacrament.

Edwin S. Gorham

Publisher and Bookseller

11 WEST 45TH STREET NEW YORK

CONTRIBUTORS FOR APRIL

The Rev. G. C. Rawlinson is a Priest of the Church of England, working at present under the Bishop of Nassau.

The Rev. Bernard Iddings Bell is President of St. Stephen's College, Annandale, New York.

The Rev. Frederic B. Hodgins is a Priest in the Diocese of Pennsylvania, and is at present connected with the Interchurch World Movement.

The Rev. William Whiting Davis is Curate at the Church of the Transfiguration, New York.

The Rev. H. C. Ackerman is Professor of Old Testament History at Nashotah, Wisconsin.

The Rev. Fleming James, Ph.D., is Rector of St. Paul's Church, Englewood, New Jersey.

The American Church Monthly

A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing with questions confronting the Anglican Communion and more especially the Church in the United States

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

42 Albany St., New Brunswick, N. J.

President: George A. Armour, Princeton, N. J.
Vice-President: Guy Van Amringe, 55 Liberty Street, New York
Secretary: The Rev. Charles C. Edmunds, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York
Treasurer: Haley Fiske, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Two Dollars a Year — Twenty Cents a Copy

Canadian subscription, $2.25 a Year — Foreign subscription, $2.50 a Year

Volume VII — April, 1920 — Number 2

Independents in Politics and Religion

IT is said that the majority of voters in the United States are independent of any political party. They pride themselves on this fact, as though it were a weakness to be a party man. Many of them may believe more or less vaguely in the traditional principles of one of the two leading parties, but they have not become active members of either of the two party organizations. So prominent a citizen as Mr. Hoover apparently cannot be claimed with assurance by either party. Likewise there are many men who are Socialists in their way of looking at political and

industrial problems, but they do not carry a red card of membership. Others sympathize with the principles of the Non-Partisan League, or the Labor Party, or the Committee of Forty-eight, but they have not formally allied themselves with any of these movements.

All this is symptomatic of the times. It is part of a widespread national disease,—the disease of irresponsible individualism. Each man is absorbed in his own little selfish concerns,—his plot of ground, his merchandise, his wife,—and he takes no practical interest in the larger affairs of society; let other men busy themselves with party organizations, with the drawing up of political platforms, with the selecting of the proper candidates, if they like. If they can render the party sufficiently attractive to him, and place in nomination the right sort of candidates, he may shake himself from his lethargy on election day and go out and vote,—or he may not! He does not really care for such matters; he cares only for himself and his petty personal pleasures and advancement.

This disease of selfish individualism has also weakened and undermined the power of Christianity in the modern world. There are multitudes of men and women who would feel deeply offended if anyone said they were not Christians, and yet they are holding aloof from any form of organized Christianity. They boast of the fact that they do not profess any creed. In a vague general way they acknowledge the validity of Christian principles of conduct, but they refuse allegiance to the faith upon which alone such conduct can be based. They are independents in religion, and for all they care every church in the world may be razed to the ground, and the clergy be reduced to starvation.

Strangely enough, independents in politics are not always independents in religion. Some of the most violent partisans in politics think it makes no difference what church they belong to so long as they are trying to live a good life. On the other hand, some of the most orthodox religionists profess no political creed. We venture to say that both of these classes are right in so far as they are Churchmen or party men, and wrong in so far as they glory in their independence. The cause of truth and righteousness and decent government can only be helped forward by men and women who know where they stand and have the courage to act in accordance with their convictions. There are too many mealy-mouthed molly-coddles wandering aimlessly about in this country, and they are a menace to the welfare both of the Church and the State.

The Search for God

IT is strange that in a land where the Gospel is so widely preached, there should be so many intelligent men and women who totally fail to understand that in Jesus Christ we have a revelation of the being and character of God, translated into human terms that even the simplest can comprehend. "God is in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself." He is the Word of God, and He informs us about God. It is as if God proclaimed from the skies to all mankind the necessary information about Himself. And yet people continue to grope about in the darkness trying to find out where God is and what He is like.

As an illustration of this very common state of mind, we may quote the following from the letter of a high-minded

and large-hearted physician about a young woman, with some mental and nervous ailments, whom he is trying to cure:

> "She has little faith in anyone and none in God. The ordinary religious approach is hopeless. She is a thinker and pretty logical. I have tried hard to make her see the possibilities of a symbolic religion. If she can't accept a literal God, to make her feel that none of us have a literal God, or if we have it is of our own making; that what we call God is too great to be compassed by human understanding, so we set up a symbol which is the best we can do. We let our partial understanding and vision stand for the whole. To me the very fact that we can't comprehend and compass a literal God is the best proof of a real divinity,—out-scoping our wildest dreams. So the beautiful symbol stands, and I am content to leave my doctrines in the hands of a God whom I do not want to understand, because if I could I should know He was not God. . . . . She would be very shy of the Church. A literal God, supposed to be endowed with all the kindliness and love of a father, and yet who can permit such suffering and injustice as we see all about us—that is the stumbling block of many earnest and thoughtful people. But when they realize that they have been trying to picture a God with their own human and limited imagination, they sometimes come to their senses and find a foothold for progress and justification."

One cannot but sympathize with the conscientious effort of this earnest and spiritual-minded doctor to bring his unfortunate young patient into contact with the healing and sanctifying life of God. But why can he not see that the simplest and truest way is to point her to the crucifix and say, "That is God," or to open to her the pages of the gospels and say, "There is the story of God, when He came to live as a Man among men"? Later on he might point her to the Blessed Sacrament and say, "There is God, waiting to give Himself to you!"

Are Broad Churchmen Narrow?

THERE are clergy and laymen in the Episcopal Church who like to designate themselves as Broad Churchmen. They lay stress upon freedom from what they call the cramping restrictions of dogma. They profess to be able and willing to tolerate with equal facility all schools of believers, misbelievers, and unbelievers. They are deeply sympathetic with modern thought, and solicitous to conform the creeds and the disciplinary system of the Church as far as may be to the exigencies of the modern man. It would hardly occur to them that it might be wise to conform the modern man to the faith and practice of the church. One could scarcely imagine them voluntarily preaching a sermon based on the words of St. Paul, "Be not conformed to this world." They have little patience with those straight-laced and narrow-minded ecclesiastics who teach their people that there really is danger of losing their souls, and appeal to them to be loyal to the faith once delivered. They prefer to think of the Christian as one who is sauntering leisurely along a broad and easy way that leads to doing and believing pretty much as one likes.

We naturally expect Broad Churchmen therefore to be tolerant of all schools of thought within the Church—and we are often disappointed! They are fairly tolerant toward unbelief, and toward every form of belief which is headed in a latitudinarian direction. They are particularly cordial to heretics, whom they regard as the real heroes on the battle-fields of human progress. But every now and then we find them extremely intolerant toward those who are striving to confine themselves within the limits of the orthodox and traditional faith, and are contending for the ancient creed.

As an illustration of this sort of intolerance we may instance the case of the editor of one of our Church weeklies, who would certainly not be offended at being classed as a Broad Churchman. He recently stated editorially that he would not read Father Hughson's latest book on "Reservation and Adoration" because he did not wish to keep his mind open to any argument for such unlawful practices. He condemns as disloyal and disobedient and lawless one of the most godly and learned priests in the Church, the superior of one of our most honored religious orders, before reading the book which he wrote for the express purpose of proving that Reservation and Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament are quite within the law in the Anglican Communion.

This sort of intolerance however was not chiefly what we had in mind when we asked the question, Are Broad Churchmen narrow? We were thinking rather of the increasing thinness of their beliefs. One by one they are casting aside the articles of the historic Christian faith, the old faith of the Gospel, until they have a very narrow platform left on which to stand. The belief in the Virgin Birth of our Lord, in His bodily Resurrection, in the true divinity of His Person, in the atonement through His death on the Cross, in His miracles, and in the sinlessness of His character,—one by one these sacred convictions, which have been knit into the bone and sinew of all the Christian saints, have been surrendered by Broad Churchmen as concessions to the fancied demands of modern thought.

In the *Chronicle* for January there is an article on "Miracles and Morals" by the Rev. Dr. S. D. McConnell, with the astounding thesis that "the special interposition by God in the orderly course of events in the interest of or at the solicitation of any man, must of necessity involve wrong and

injustice to other men." Dr. McConnell is troubled by the thought that the miraculous release of St. Peter from prison cost the lives of a dozen innocent soldiers who had never heard of either Peter or his Master. Just why the Creator and Ruler of the universe should not have the right to terminate our bodily existence at any time we cannot see. Neither can we see how this jejune and shallow attack on the miracles recorded in the Bible should aid in the promotion of evangelical knowledge. Yet the *Chronicle* advertises itself as "the official magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Society for the Promotion of Evangelical Knowledge."

What is left of the Christian religion after all its supernatural elements are obliterated? It tells us merely of a deluded teacher who went about doing good and teaching men that God was their Father. The glorious faith of Catholic Christendom is reduced to an emasculated Christianity, a vague humanitarian movement, whose chief aim is to make people comfortable in this world, and oblivious to the eternal Kingdom which God is preparing.

The Episcopal Church and Papalism

A WRITER in the Roman Catholic weekly *America* for February 21, 1920, has accused the Episcopal Church of having become Papal in its organization. He refers to the recent legislation of the General Convention by which the executive management of the Church is to be turned over to the Executive Council and its President, Bishop Gailor. He quotes the words of Bishop Lloyd to the effect that "the Church has finally found out that a headless body cannot have intelligence." After having for several cen-

turies declared the Papacy and the Curia to be guilty of a fraudulent usurpation of power, we have now created a Pope and a college of Cardinals all our own.

We can understand why this recent action of the General Convention might be misinterpreted by Roman Catholics, and perhaps by some of our own people. We wish therefore to point out some of the reasons why this criticism is not in accordance with the facts.

We do not object to the Pope because he is the executive head of the Roman Church. If we could have Christian unity tomorrow we would be willing to accept the Pope as the executive head of the whole Church. We could wholeheartedly submit to him as the Primate of Christendom, and as the chief among the bishops of the Catholic Church on the understanding that all bishops are endowed by divine right with equal powers. What we object to is the claim of the Bishop of Rome to be the supreme ruler of the Church, the vice-gerent of God on earth, and his assumption of the power to appoint bishops in all vacant sees. We also object to his claim to be the infallible teacher of the whole Church on matters of faith and morals. We would gladly accord to the Pope all the powers with reference to the whole Church that have been granted to Bishop Gailor with reference to the provinces of the Catholic Church under the control of General Convention.

We have no hesitation in saying that the assertion that the Pope has by divine right supreme jurisdiction over the whole Church as set forth in the bull *Satis Cognitum* of Pope Leo XIII is the foremost obstacle to the reunion of Christendom. The Pope does not even admit of any principle of development in the powers of Roman Papacy. He contends in his bull that "in the decree of the Vatican Council as to the nature and authority of the primacy of the Ro-

man Pontiff, no newly conceived opinion is set forth, but the venerable and constant belief of every age." We believe on the contrary that the modern claims of Papalism are opposed to the divine constitution of the Catholic Church. They are out of harmony with Catholic tradition, and they cannot be proven by Holy Scripture. If the present Pope would exercise his alleged infallibility and publish to the whole Church an authoritative pronouncement on the claims of the Papacy, which would be more in accord with Scripture and Catholic tradition, he would do greater service for the cause of Christian unity than could be done by any other man living.

An Approach Towards What?

THE situation produced by the Concordat controversy is not without its humorous elements. The Proposals for an Approach towards Unity originated in a small circle of our clergy most of whom believe in the Catholicity of the Episcopal Church. And yet the vast majority of Catholics in the Episcopal Church are unalterably opposed to the plan.

The chief support of the Proposals is to be found among those who believe neither in the Catholicity of the Church nor in the priesthood. They are perfectly willing to give the Congregationalists whatever they want, but they cannot understand why the Congregational ministers are not satisfied with their own orders. As for the priesthood, they cannot understand why anyone should want it.

The Congregationalists as a whole take no interest whatever in the Concordat. Its advocates are a few "high church" Congregational ministers who would like to be

priests, but who also wish to continue their adherence to a polity which historically has been as far as possible removed from the episcopate and the priesthood.

If the proposed Concordat is put into operation, with whatever reservations, it will probably have the effect of introducing sharp divisions among members of the Episcopal Church, and also of creating two kinds of Congregationalists. Thus instead of having two religious bodies which might conceivably be brought together, we shall have four which can never be brought into an agreement. We suggest to the Joint Commission a revision of the title of the Concordat, so that it will read, "Proposals for an Approach Towards Greater Disunity."

Incidentally may we ask those who are bursting for utterance on this subject to refrain from sending us any more articles criticizing the Concordat? We are already deluged with such articles, and there is really not much more that can be said on the subject.

We would like very much to see inaugurated a positive and constructive movement looking towards the reunion of the great body of Protestants. We see no reason why we should not take part in any such movement as the one whose representatives recently met in Philadelphia to devise a plan for the organic unity of Protestant Christian Churches in the United States. We believe that Bishop Talbot was quite right in acting in his individual capacity, and giving the benefit of his counsel to this movement. Is it too much to hope that some of our religious leaders may have sufficient breadth of vision to set forth proposals for a still larger unity which would embrace also the Churches of the Anglican Communion? We believe that only the greatest harm to the cause of unity can result from such ill-advised subterranean short-cuts as the Concordat.

The Present Position of Spiritualism

Rev. G. C. Rawlinson

IT is probably no exaggeration to say that, at the middle of the last century, spiritualism had fallen on evil days. It was intellectually disreputable. Those who profess it, were on the whole, men of low mental calibre, and the immense majority of learned men refused to admit that there was even a *prima facie* case for investigating its assertions. It passed among them for a contemptible example of human folly and superstition. Morally it was no better. Fraud was to be found everywhere and few could be found to deny the justice of Robert Browning's castigation of the average spiritualist in his "Mr. Sledge the Medium." Any one tempted to prophecy would probably have felt it safe to predict that, with the advance and spread of science, in fifty years spiritualism would either have vanished altogether from the face of the globe, or would merely be dragging out a dishonorable underground existence in corners where the light of reason had not yet penetrated.

I

But this has not happened. Instead spiritualism enjoys a credit today which, it is safe to say, it has never had before. It has its disciples in every rank of life and counts among them a fair number who bear distinguished names in the world of letters and the world of science. Many others, who are not yet converted, regard the movement with interest and even with sympathy. This, it may be said in passing, must be highly satisfying to the ghosts of D. D. Home, Stainton Moses, and others who lived in the dark ages of spiritualism, and one can imagine a piquant dialo-

gue between Stainton Moses and Huxley should they chance to run across one another in the world of shades. The change began with the formation of the Society for Psychical Research by Mr. Frederic Myers and Mr. Edward Gurney in the eighties of the last century. These men, with a few others, believed that psychical phenomena deserved the same thorough investigation as physical, and that such investigation should be carried out with openmindedness and without *parti pris.* In the last thirty years the Society has collected a vast amount of evidence which has been sifted in the most relentless and thorough fashion. Few people would be found to deny that telepathy has now been established as, at any rate, a good working hypothesis. The evidence concerning apparitions fills several Gargantuan volumes but the hypothesis that will account for all of it is yet to seek. Of recent years the energies of the Society have been devoted more and more to the story of the evidence alleged to prove communication with the departed. Some of its most distinguished members have been converted to the belief, chief among them being Sir Oliver Lodge. It was the publication of his "Raymond" that first brought a knowledge of these investigations to the general public and became, in a way, the gospel of the new spiritualism. Those who desire to inform themselves of the sort of evidence that is produced, without wading through the morass of inferior and frequently childish publications, may be advised to read this book together with Mr. J. Arthur Hill's "Psychical Investigations," Sir William Barrett's "On the Threshold of the Unseen," and "The Ear of Dionysius," by Mr. Gerald Balfour. The best evidence for survival may be found in them, especially in the last-named which contains, in my opinion, by far the most powerful evidence that has yet been published. I cannot attach any value to the com-

munications that profess to come from a spirit named "Patience Worth," though I understand that these have attracted a considerable amount of attention in America. A volume entitled "The Gate of Remembrance," by Mr. Bligh Bond, telling of certain archaeological discoveries that were made at Glastonbury through automatic writing, is interesting and may prove to be exceedingly valuable. At any rate the evidence has convinced a certain number of distinguished minds who have by it come to the conclusion that there is a life after death and that communication of a kind is possible between the dead and the living. To believe in such communication through a medium is no longer one of the beliefs which no sensible man professes. The late Sir Mountstuart Grant Duff in his "Notes from a Diary," written forty years ago, was highly amused at the story of a parrot which struck in at the end of a spiritistic story: "No, no; that's too much." Much water has rolled under the bridge since then. To believe in spiritualism is not now regarded by anyone as a sign of mental deficiency.

II

An analysis of the evidence shows that it varies greatly in value. Much of it would convince nobody except those fanatical adherents who are ready to believe anything that agrees with their wishes. There may be included in this nearly all those professed descriptions of what life in the next world is like. If the life in the world to come were really the commonplace, unintelligent thing it is pictured to be in many of these books, it would, instead of making people eager for it, add a new terror to death. We may leave all this literature out of account. It is written by believers for believers and probably does not aim to convince others. The ablest among the spiritualists are thoroughly ashamed

of it. Indeed one cannot help sometimes sympathizing with them if one tries to realize their feelings when confronted with these caricatures of their own cherished and reasonably-held beliefs. Secondly there is the mass of evidence for which another possible explanation, other than the spiritualistic, may be found. Spiritualists are often very angry when the telepathic hypothesis is invoked. They complain that this hypothesis is too hard-worked and is used frequently in an illegitimate manner. Very likely they are right. It seems there are some cases which cannot be explained by telepathy, but, on the other hand, there are certainly a fair number of cases which can be satisfactorily explained by the working of this law. What is wanted is evidence that can be explained in no other way than by the hypothesis of spirit-communication. This is perfectly recognized by Sir Oliver Lodge and the rest of the able men who are working in conjunction with him. Much of the evidence that they get is at any rate patient of another explanation; therefore, even though they may not themselves think the other explanation is the true one, they put this aside for the present as not being "evidential." There remains then this third class of evidential communications. Of them they believe that, not only the most reasonable, but the only possible explanation is that they come from some mind not now in the body. Much of the evidence in "Raymond" was of this kind. In one case information concerning a photograph was given which was not possessed at the time by any of the recipients of the message, and therefore could not have been due to telepathy, which information was later shown to be correct. Some of the evidence is of a more complicated nature. It is supposed that certain spirits in the unseen world are endeavoring to prove their continued existence by sending messages in bits, part to one

recipient and part to another, neither knowing what the other has received, and the message only making sense when the disconnected parts are put together. The different parts of the message may also be strung out over a considerable space of time. "The Ear of Dionysius," which I mentioned above, is the most striking of these puzzles. It professes to come from the late Professors S. H. Butcher and A. W. Verrall, and to be designed to prove their continued existence. But even in this evidence, strong as it is, there are weak points. It is not easy to see why the spirits, if they are able to communicate, should always avoid direct tests or fail in them. Thus the late Mr. Myers, it is said, left behind him a sealed communication of which no one knew the contents but himself. These he promised to reveal, if possible, by a message after death. Yet he failed to do this. A communication, it is true, came professedly from him but its contents did not correspond with the contents of the sealed letter. Another somewhat similar failure came from America. A young man, named Owen Bridgman Conner, had gone with a circus company to Mexico, and was reported to have died there of enteric fever. But messages came, received through the well-known medium Mrs. Piper, stating that he was not dead but had been kidnapped and was being held to ransom. These messages were believed by his relatives and several search parties were organized, all meeting with failures. In the end it was conclusively proved, by a journalist who took up the case, that young Conner had died in hospital, as had been said at first. The communicating spirits, if there were such, were either wrong or were intent to deceive. It will be seen then that while much of the evidence appears first-rate and to point to the genuineness of the communications, there is also a considerable amount that seems to point the other way. The

tendency of most people is, like Nelson, to turn a blind eye to one part of the evidence or the other. This leads to much embittered controversy and to the losing of many tempers. Neither the attitude of the dogmatic believers, nor that of the dogmatic unbelievers, are favorable to scientific investigation. It may be said, however, that the spiritualistic hypothesis is not impossible and may be held without defiance of reason. Approaching the subject strictly from the scientific point of view, it is allowable to say: It may be true.

III

Supposing it is true, it is worth while to turn aside for a moment and ask how it squares with the Christian religion. Some persons are found to say that it has come as a providential reinforcement of Christian faith; others, like Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, look upon it as a new revelation and a new religion destined to be erected on the ruins of the Christian Churches. Which of these exactly opposite statements is true? If these are genuine communications from the departed; if, for instance, the descriptions of the future life given in "Raymond" correspond to fact, can they be reconciled with the teaching of Christianity, or will it have to be recognized that this teaching has been, in a matter of tremendous and vital importance, entirely wrong? There is need, I think, to distinguish. With the accepted Protestant teaching concerning the future life it seems to be entirely irreconcilable. Protestantism teaches that, after death, the souls of the dead go straight either to heaven or to hell. There is no third place. But, if one thing stands out clearly in the spiritualistic evidence, it is that the place where these souls are now is not in the least like either heaven or hell. It is more like a continuance of this life under slightly different circumstances than anything else. To call it either

heaven or hell is an abuse of terms. Protestantism therefore is concerned to fight spiritualism to the death. That this is so in the case of Catholicism is not quite so clear. Catholicism admits a purgatory in which the souls of the dead are kept until such time as they are fit to enter heaven. It is not absolutely impossible to suppose that the next life of the spiritualists is some kind of purgatory and some of the messages speak of it in this light. Catholicism also teaches the existence of Limbo, a place of natural happiness, where the souls of good heathen and unbaptized infants, who have not received the gift of supernatural life, which is the qualification for heaven, are kept. It might be possible to identify the world of the spiritualistic messages with this, though there are theological difficulties in the way. It seems, however, fairly evident, if the communications are genuine, that only a very few of the dead are in a position, or have the wish, to communicate. There are no messages from lost souls, and none, moreover, from those who have died with their minds set upon God. All those messages, which have decent evidence to support them, come from a class of souls who have died with their eye turned back upon earth; died reluctantly, as it were, and without any desire for a more intensified kind of spiritual life. So that it is not impossible that communications may occasionally be established with one corner of the unseen world. More than that it would be very rash to assert.

IV

But is it necessary to make any such assertion? Is the state of the evidence such that, if we are honest investigators, it is incumbent upon us to admit so much at least, of the spiritualist argument? I cannot think so. While I believe that the spirit-communication hypothesis is not neces-

sarily true, I think it is, perhaps, not entirely inconsistent with the Catholic religion. I believe the hypothesis to be entirely premature, and one that is likely to be discarded with the advance of knowledge. The science of psychology is, as yet, hardly out of its infancy. It has, however, already explained a number of mysteries that puzzled our grandfathers. Telepathy is an instance of this. It is now pretty generally recognized that in the working of this law we have a simple and natural explanation of a large number of tales of apparitions and of a not inconsiderable number of professed spirit-communications. But, if this is the case, it is only reasonable to expect that psychology may be able to explain all. Spiritualists are too ready to assume that, with the discovery of telepathy, the science of psychology has come to an end of its discoveries. Such an attitude, however, is entirely unscientific. Our attitude, it seems to me, should be as follows: Here are a number of mysterious occurrences; psychology can explain some, but not all; the probability is, however, that, as knowledge advances, a natural explanation will be found for the rest. Till then we must suspend our judgment. The spiritualist, on the contrary says: psychology can only explain some of the occurrences; since it cannot explain all, we must seek the answer elsewhere. People are spiritualists, I believe, in a great number of cases, because they want an immediate answer to everything, and are not willing to wait till some one strikes on the illuminating hypothesis that will make all these dark places plain. But the Darwin of psychology is probably already born, and may even already be a student of the subject. Meanwhile it is possible that advance will be made on the lines proposed by Henri Bergson. His suggestion that the mind has an infinitely richer content than is generally supposed, and that memory, for instance, is really

an inhibiting faculty to keep in the background all that is not necessary for the purposes of action, lends itself to startling developments. The dabbler in psychics may be groping in certain recesses of the mind which the whole tendency of evolution is to suppress. Indeed it is far from impossible that, with the advance of the race and the more perfect adaptation of the individual to his environment, the psychic faculty may be gradually being weeded out. It is more common in savages than in civilized men. It seems of no use whatever for the purposes of life, and those who possess it in a developed form are generally quite useless people. The faculty, may, perhaps, be compared with the faculty other people possess, a faculty inherited from a long forgotten ancestry, of pricking their ears like a dog. Even if it is possible, through the use of this faculty, to communicate with some beings in the unseen world, the same argument may be used. Such communication distracts, both from usefulness in this world and from the practice of the true spiritual life.

V

My conclusions then are as follows:

1. It is just possible that messages may occasionally be received from the departed.

2. It is much more likely that a purely natural explanation will be found to explain all these occurrences. The science of chemistry and the science of astronomy were both created in superstition: why not also the science of psychology?

3. The only scientific attitude, at present, is suspension of judgment.

Sir Arthur Conan Doyle thinks we are the witnesses of a new revelation. It is more likely we are assisting at the birth of a new science.

A Renewal of Faith

Rev. Bernard Iddings Bell.

"THERE was never any time during the War," said my companion at a dinner not long since in Boston, "when I had any doubt about the governance of God and the inevitable triumph of right. Not a single moment but I believed absolutely in the only possible outcome of it all. But since the War, my dear sir, things are different with me, somehow. The world is confused and confusing. God has hidden His face from me, sir, and there has come over me a vague feeling, which I cannot dispel, that the world is such a mad disorder that no God could have made it and no God can possibly be ruling it. My old faith seems like a mental delusion to me. I wonder if it is because I am getting on toward seventy."

Of course it was not because of that. A great many people, even as young as I myself, have felt much that same way these last few months. Most of us have tasted the bitterness of those uncertainties which are ours at this time. How simple was the world, how plain was duty, how inevitable was right, how almost visible was God, come from Sinai with His legions of angels, to fight with man against the Evil One,—twenty months ago! Since the armistice was signed, life has not exhibited that lack of complexity. Of course my friend felt decrepit, but so do most of us. When vision is clear, that is youth; when it is blurred, that is age.

We who, awakened suddenly from a materialist fool's paradise by the War, were under the necessity of readjusting our whole theory of life, now that weary thing is over,

have had again, most unwillingly, to reform our philosophy. This time the task is the more difficult because the very drama of the war did the job for us before, while now, unhelped by pageantry or sweeping unity of world movement, we must do it for ourselves. That we have not as yet succeeded in doing it is the real reason for our great distress. We are sick, and we know that we are; but we have not as yet diagnosed the sickness.

During these troubled months I have been transplanted from a life among myriads of emerging sailor-men in a great male city of barns north of Chicago, where routine moved, and moved one with it, where the bustle made unnecessary and indeed impossible any sustained thinking, to a house by the quiet middle reaches of the Hudson, where my work is to preside over a college of arts and letters,—a college small enough to be free from the busy efficiency and absorbing machinery of a great university, a college where one man seems an important thing, and from which life as a whole is a complex far enough removed to be dispassionately observed. From my breakfast-room window I see rising before me the self-possessed Catskills. As I celebrate in the chapel, the cheerful chatter of the birds which nest in the ivy is usually all that breaks the solemn hush of Consecration-time. A ten minute walk takes me along a stream which has carved a deep ravine in these old rock-hills. My friend, the geologist, tells me that probably it was running there imperturbably when Abraham came out of Chaldaea. It has been easy, sometimes too easy, to think, and to do that other educative thing, to feel subconsciously the moving of great, calming forces.

At last, and gradually, I have found for myself a sufficient peace, in the bustle of these days of demobilization. Occasionally I have gone from here, somewhere or other,

and told people how I had come to think and feel, and they have, apparently, found it interesting. I sometimes wonder why, for it is very simple, very naïve, very old-fashioned. Indeed, one sad young reporter on a metropolitan paper has told me that it is entirely too simple to be credible. It may be so. At any rate, it satisfies me, and has freed me for busy labor and for cheerfulness in these which are to many people gloomy and soporific days.

I

The disease from which the world is suffering is a very old one. It is called, in the language of the street, "selfishness"; in the language of religion, "sin." Sin is not, and never has been, the violation of certain hard-and-fast, arbitrary rulings made by the Deity or by society, the breaking of heavenly or earthly taboos. What the moralists are really, though often it would seem subconsciously, driving at is that to be selfish is the evil. The disease is as venerable as man. The race has been combating it since before records were made. It is a highly comforting thing to realize that our universal malady is not some new distemper, due to a germ unknown to the savants, like Spanish influenza, but our familiar infirmity of the ages. To fight against an enemy well-known, whose tricks are recorded so plainly that even a way-faring man though a fool cannot err much therein, in the books of history, the biographies and the scientific researches of our fathers from time immemorial, is much less terrifying than to skirmish against some ghastly, unknown pestilence. There are people who suppose that some dreadful new ailment has come upon us. They are unduly scared by its supposed mystery. The first step toward clear thinking is the recognition that there is no mystery at all about it.

It was selfishness which produced the war,—the desire on the part of one nation to dominate other nations for the lifting-up of its own prestige, the enlargement of its markets, the promotion of its own prosperity, at the cost of those of other peoples. During the war we came to call this "Teutonism," but today we begin to understand that the disease is not purely Teutonic. It was because of this, their madness, that we bound ourselves together, in a fraternity of nations which was itself the negation of that against which we were contending, to fight them, lay them low, and bid them build again.

It is truly disconcerting to find that, having destroyed our enemies, we have by no means destroyed their evil ideas. It is distressing to see that unity of the Allies which was such a joy to us visibly growing less and less strong. One reads with sickness of heart, for example, of rumors that Anglican pan-Arabism is to be combated by French pan-Turkism; that Italy is deeply aggrieved at not getting what she deems her due share of the "spoils of war"; that the League of Nations is a nonsensical concept of mere dreamers; and that we must return to the day of offensive and defensive alliances, supported by treaties such as many a nation in history besides Germany has been pleased when convenient to consider mere scraps of paper. None of these things may, in the end, prove actual, but that some of the greatest leaders of the War should be saying that they are true is in itself jolting to us, who so short a time ago as 1918 instinctively believed all altruism on one side of the struggle and all self-concentration on the other.

The spiritual motivations of the world have not been changed by conflict. Again we begin to see war as the futile thing it has always proved to be. While war has been of value to break, occasionally, some nation whose self-ag-

grandizement has become too great to be endured even by nations not themselves wholly clean,—as was the case in the late War,—war is of no value at all as a racial purgative. It engenders little or no lasting idealism. It is parent of small if any essential righteousness. The struggle smashed Germany. That was a necessary thing. It did not smash the evil in Germany. It did not materially lessen the evil in the enemies of Germany. National selfishness is still the moving force of the earth. The old order has almost entirely smothered, in a quiet but efficient manner, the new idealism.

We are seemingly sowing the seeds of many future wars at the present moment. Apparently there is little better to be hoped for than that, when some other nation,—no one knows now which,—gets as bad as Germany once was, we shall have another world-war and smash her too. This prospect seems ghastly enough to us Americans. We went into the war to destroy war by crushing pan-Germanism. We see now that all we have destroyed has been pan-Germanism. A liberal, an unselfish, a rational, a human international morality, comes not from battle. Most of us feel like dreamers awakening. Our cousins overseas were wiser. They knew, from sad experience, the futility of war as a promoter of fraternal internationalism. The process of American disillusionment has been most unpleasant.

Industrially, also, we are very sick indeed; but again our disease is not a new one. It may be called by many novel names, such as "proletarian revolution," "industrial unrest," "Bolshevism," or from the other side of the fence, "desire for unearned increment," "reactionary coercion," "Bourbonism"; but it is only our old enemy, selfishness, after all. For decades those in control of capital and industry, largely inspired by an idea, not of service to the community,

but of exploitation of the community, have devoted themselves to the making of unjustified and immoral profits. Now labor, having learned its social immorality from capital, seems to have determined that the time has come for it to assume control of industry and direct it, not for service of all, but for exploitation of the community and the making of unjustified and immoral wages. These merry madnesses are fast impelling us into industrial bankruptcy. We shall continue so to be impelled,—no matter who controls our economic processes, no matter how rapidly may be increased our mechanical means of production, no matter what radical or conservative solution is followed with a view to our social salvation,—unless we can change the motivation of men industrially from that of would-be exploiters to that of willingly unselfih servers of a cooperating humanity. If anyone exclaims that this is impossible, then we have a right to retort that civilization is impossible.

Similarly we are ill politically, educationally, philosophically; sick from a literary, a musical, and artistic point of view; and diseased in our methods of labor, of living, of amusement. The trouble in every case, upon analysis, proves to be—just selfishness.

For a long time we have been developing a type of life and establishing a sort of education which have induced a race of educated animals instead of a race of human beings. The difference between a lower animal and a man lies not in the superiority of the latter in intelligence, or in the replacement of instinct by reason in the development of the one out of the other. Studies in both animal and human psychology have tended to weaken our belief in this once comfortable delusion. The difference between them essentially is ethical. A healthy, sane, and successful animal lives for himself; while, because of some implanting by

God unknown to us in time or place, a healthy, sane and successful human being refuses to live for himself. Animal survival is based upon the presence of efficient acquisitiveness. Human society survives in the long run only in proportion to its willingness and ability to substitute fraternalism for this animal virtue. From the manifold instances of history, from innumerable volumes containing intimate personal confessions and canny comments upon life, from the sacred books of every powerful religion of the earth, and instinctively from the hearts of men, comes testimony to the validity of this universal moral law: *That man, that nation, that civilization devoted to selfish aggrandizement spiritually rots; that man, that nation, that civilization devoted to fraternal self-sacrific spiritually survives.*

This simple law we have almost forgotten. That is what is the matter with us. That is all that is the matter with us.

II

Precisely because a great many of us know that we are very ill we are today increasingly shouting, with great impatience, at the established teachers of religion. It seems to us the business of religion to have a cure for our distress. We were wont, in the not distant past, to look confidently for other cures to the world's defects. Once education was supposed to have the necessary healing quality resident in it. While our forefathers had built churches and founded church colleges, our fathers forsook the churches and secularized the colleges, while public libraries increasingly dotted the country. Even Boston lost its Puritans and developed its Brahmins. But today even professional educators are dimly perceiving that those former persons who maintained that education is merely the handmaid of religion were not such fools as they were esteemed, let us say, in

1900. Germany, the best educated nation in the world, has taught us something not in her own curriculum. Material invention, too, wherein some of us once trusted, in our curious obsession in materialism, for the regeneration of life, proved a sorry thing in war-time, when the very improvements designed for the betterment of life proved agencies for the more diabolic promotion of death. The common feeling is increasingly perceptive of all this. The ingenuities and the clevernesses of man have proven ineffective. Therefore, more and more, with all the savageness of disillusioned men, we are turning to the churches,—and denouncing them for not being ready with help in time of need.

The churches are not, it must be confessed, very helpful as yet in the world emergency; but this is not because religion too is inutile. Religion has for many years been deprived of the best interest, the keenest wits, and the heartiest devotion of the leaders of the world. Small wonder therefore that it has become curiously static, clothed in phrases once vital but now a bit frayed and faded. Small wonder that there are few spiritual leaders in the pulpits. Leaders can hardly be made in a generation when the men who have offered themselves for the ministry have been of constantly decreasing calibre, and when the occasional leader who has gone in for it has been hampered by the neglect, the patronage, the scarce-concealed contempt of a people intent upon their fleshpots. It is most unjust to expect our spiritual pastors and prophets, all at once, when they themselves are in the tumult of transition, suddenly challenged by a world which never before has been willing to give the slightest ear, to speak with authority and not as the scribes. The utterance of spiritual messages is not an easy task. Many amateurs of late, Mr. Wells and Mr. Clut-

ton-Brock for instance, impatient of the churches, have sought to become preachers all at once, and have found that it is quite beyond them, too, effectively to speak in the name of the Eternal.

Eventually, however, it is from religion that moral and social reconstruction must come. More than measures, more than methods, more than theories, more than philosophies, more than solutions, more than panaceas, we today need men; and in the great business of producing men, the making of them out of ordinary human material, that contact with the eternal spiritual reality which we call religion has been, whenever men have given to it any real and unaffected interest, the chief contributing factor. The Christian God has made men in times far worse than ours, and again and again saved the world from itself. Thus, for instance, men were made when Rome had collapsed and darkness reigned. Thus men were made when Renaissance self-exaltation had eaten the heart out of Medievalism and left a rotten shell. Thus men can be made today, when we shall have so shaken the churches that they once more realize that Christianity's God is a living force in this twentieth as well as in former venerated centuries.

III

Christianity's God makes men by a very simple process, and one not hard to be discovered. As Jesus treated men in the Holy Land long ago, Christianity maintains, so God treats men forever. One has only to read the Gospels, then, to discover the method.

Jesus does not seem to have placed much reliance in the attempt to create human character by means of legislation. Only in her decadent and most stupid periods has His church ever sought so to do it. To provide for external

application an ethical shell composed of liberal sections of "You must do this," and "You must not do that," was evidently to him a thing quite uninteresting. He gave a casual and occasional advocacy to obeying the law, for law conserves, imperfectly but truly, what former peoples have discovered ethically in their experimentation. Law is a schoolmaster. But that it does not create character Jesus stoutly maintained, and both He and His early followers spent much time talking of the insufficiency of legalism.

Jesus, in the second place, did not believe in the utility of scolding. He scolded none save hypocrites, for whom no moralist has ever been able to hold out hope of advance until they have been jarred out of their hypocrisy. He seems to have well understood that when some holy person, conscious of his own impeccability, calls us "abominable," "rotten," "vile," "despicable," even though the charges are to our own knowledge quite true, it never makes us desire to become better men, but rather merely to visit personal chastisement upon the Pharisee.

Christ's method of making men is vividly illustrated in the case of Zacchaeus. Before Jesus treated him he could scarcely be said to have become a man. He was a publican, one of those persons who, backed by the imperial constabulary, squeezed full taxes for Rome out of the peasant grubbers in an unwilling soul, and then squeezed a bit extra for himself. Zacchaeus was one of a class of animals who lived definitely for getting and not for giving. A short person, he was unable to see over the heads of the crowd which gathered to see Jesus come to town, a crowd which elbowed him back from the place of vantage in the front. Like any sensible man, he climbed a tree. Jesus saw him sitting in the branches, and stopped. The Apostles, those men of carnal wisdom, doubtless waited in anticipation of hearing this

person with the hungry claws treated to a dose of verbal vitriol; but Jesus merely asked Zacchaeus to be his host at dinner.

There is no written account of what the publican said to himself on the way home, but it is not impossible—from one's own experience to reconstruct his thoughts. He told himself, without doubt, that he was a dirty, money-grubbing caricature of a man, that he knew it and that his neighbors knew it. Yet this Jesus, the holy Nazarene, the good man, could have dined anywhere,—with the leader of the synagogue, with the local banker, with the most meticulous Pharisee,—and yet chose to eat with him. The Nazarene must suppose, despite all, that beneath the publican lay the potential man. If the Nazarene supposed that, he must not disappoint this startling, this humbling, this tear-compelling confidence. Therefore, when Jesus came to the house, Zacchaeus stood forth and announced that he was about to give away half his wealth and to restore his unjust exactions four-fold. Jesus made a man that day out of a mere beast, solely by his belief in the worth and possible nobility of a human soul, manifested in a contact of simple friendliness.

It was thus that Jesus treated everyone,—the poor prostitute whom men desired to stone, the headstrong Peter, the ambitions family of Zebedee, even the centurion who commanded his executioners. Thus, according to Christianity, God treats men always, even until now. It is such a God that Christianity has within it the power of revealing to this age, as the transformer of men and through men of nations and of civilization.

If the world is to have produced within it and for it men in sufficient number to save us from sharing the fate of the cultures now buried under the dust heaps of the earth's

wildernesses, it must find its contact with an optimistic, a confident, a friendly God. The preaching of a deity who thirsts with mad joy for punishment merely makes the age more pig-headed, the race more determined to go its own way regardless of consequences. The presentation of a God who is but an apotheosis of Mrs. Grundy and Poor Richard frets those who rightly feel that talky-talk morality sounds tinkly in a world near madness. But a God who still believes in us; who is not discouraged after our nineteen centuries of wilfulness and waste of His good grace; who yet pleads that we may be forgiven because we know not what we do; who is sublimely confident that even this seemingly degenerate time has within it the possibility of humility, simplicity, self-effacement, and uttermost sacrifice; who holds out hands of helpfulness to us as we struggle upwards from the posture of the ape to the stature of man; who reigns from a bitter tree where with us He, the self-forgetful, shares the pains that follow selfishness; if once lifted up shall draw us all to Him that He may make us truly men.

Out of these months, then, there has come realization that two very old phrases are today quite strangely new. One of them is, *Crux mundi medicina.* The other one is, *Christus mundi amicus.* They are no longer phrases merely of the study and the sanctuary. They synthesize and explain the daily papers, chance conversations with puzzled people, the books that are being written and read. To know that selfishness is the disease, that sacrifice is the only way out, and that God Himself is both the Sacrificer and the Comrade of sacrificers, can turn our modern madness into energizing sanity.

The Interchurch World Movement

Rev. Frederick R. Hodgins

THE Interchurch World Movement is a voluntary association made up chiefly of the executive agencies of the various evangelical Christian churches of North America. They number 140 and represent 34 such churches whose membership is over 70 per cent of the total non-Roman Catholic constituency. These executive agencies are concerned with the prosecution of pastoral, evangelistic, educational, medical and social service work of various kinds at home and abroad and also deal with the problems of ministerial support and relief and the provision of hospitals and homes for children and aged dependents.

The Movement came into being in response to a call issued by the Foreign Missions Board of the Presbyterian Church South. The call was answered by 133 representatives of various mission boards who met in New York City on December 17, 1918, and unanimously agreed that the peculiar circumstances of the times demanded a greater degree of immediate cooperative action by all the evangelical church agencies of the country.

A committee of twenty was named to report a plan of organization and procedure. This plan was subsequently approved by the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, by the Home Missions Council, the Council of Church Boards of Education, the Sunday School Council, the Federation of Women's Boards of Foreign Missions, and the council of Women for Home Missions.

In all, about 80 evangelical church agencies have formally endorsed the Movement and have entered into affiliated and cooperative relations with it.

Relations with Other Agencies

In answer to the question: "Does not the Interchurch World Movement duplicate the work of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America?" it should be remembered that the Federal Council derives its authority from the official judicatories of the various churches. It could not undertake such a movement as the Interchurch without express sanction of these judicatories, and since some of these meet only at intervals of years it would have been impossible for the Interchurch World Movement to have been launched through the Federal Council without causing that body to exceed its constitutional authority. The situation, moreover, was too urgent and the emergency too acute to wait until the Federal Council should have received official authority to act in the premises. The Federal Council, however, has endorsed the Interchurch World Movement and is cooperating heartily with it. No other agency of the churches, as at present constituted, being capable of undertaking a world task of such magnitude, the Interchurch World Movement was necessarily called into being.

It should also be noted that the Interchurch World Movement is not a union of churches or a combination of ecclesiastical bodies; it does not propose the merging of any organization into any other; it does not ask any church to give up any of its distinctive features; it does not invite nor does it want any organization to surrender a single one of its rights.

The Interchurch World Movement is strictly and solely intended to promote cooperation among Christians of every name to the fullest possible and legitimate extent for the furtherance of those aims held in common by all who desire to see the church fulfil the terms of the Great Com-

mission to "preach the Gospel to every creature." In the World War each of the allied nations preserved its national integrity and kept its army intact but participated in a unified and coordinated plan of campaign which finally resulted in achieving the ends sought by each and all. Likewise in the Interchurch World Movement the Christian churches are to preserve their integrity and keep their forces intact while participating in a unified and coordinated plan of campaign which similarly promises glorious spiritual results.

The Church and the State

Although definitions are usually inadequate, yet if it be agreed, as Frederick Denison Maurice declared, that the membership of the church is that portion of human society that has established right relations with God, primarily by Holy Baptism, then the church is not something distinct from the state but an integral and influential part of it. Viewed in this light, the separation of church and state is seen to be a wise provision to promote cooperation without either infringing upon the proper province of the other. The church thus becomes the source and inspiration of those moral standards which civil legislation inscribes upon the statute books as the approved ideals of general conduct. These may fall short of the fullest Christian idealism but they keep fairly equal pace with the growth of the influence which the church is able to exert in human affairs. Their failure to realize perfection is a constant incentive to the church to move forward in her promotion of Christian idealism.

This is the underlying reason for the Interchurch World Movement's intervention in world-politics on what might be called its moral side. The church's place in the state gives it the rightful opportunity to do so and logically compels it

to make the most of it. As Emerson finely says: "In all the worlds of God there is no escape but performance." The church cannot escape from this logical necessity nor resist this divine impulse. She does not seek to usurp the rightful function within it by use of legalized, constitutional processes. She fills the legalized content of statecraft with the necessary moral force to make it effective and supplies the motive-power for every spiritual advance. She adds to the cold morality of the state fires of emotion which, as Mathew Arnold says, transforms it into religion. Morality then ceases to be law because it becomes the breath of life.

Every government has one ear perpetually intent upon listening to advice based upon considerations of national self-interest. This motive, left to itself, always and inevitably hardens into selfishness. It is good and necessary for governments to have the other ear intent upon listening to influential counterbalancing advisors who acknowledge a higher law based upon moral ideals. These are the missionaries who are opposing to the love of gain the gain of love.

The World as the Interchurch World Movement Sees It

1. *It is a sick world.* The death rate in many countries—especially in the East—is very high. It would be, in a country like America, considered almost an epidemic rate. It is largely preventable. It makes for inefficiency and is very costly. It spreads infection all over the world. There is great need for many more hospitals, doctors and nurses. Governments, whether Christian or un-Christian, provide an utterly inadequate supply of these. Besides, there is lacking, in governmental or municipal hospitals, that Christian atmosphere so essential to proper care. Hospitals under Christian auspices give the opportunity for the presentation of the gospel message under the most favorable cir-

cumstances. In Mohammedan communities the blight of fatalism precludes organized medical care by Moslems themselves. Here is where Christianity can score tremendously.

2. *It is an ignorant world.* The percentage of illiteracy in the world is appalling. In India it is as high as 95 per cent. In southeastern Europe, where most of our recent immigration has come from it is as high as 65 per cent. The average percentage of illiteracy in the immigrants who have recently come to the U. S. is more than 25 per cent.

In many instances illiteracy is the direct result of an utter lack of care, personal interest or kindly social contacts in the home land. The Christian missionary, abroad and at home, is about the first to establish friendly social contacts with the illiterate and to help him. The Christian church in America must devote an increasing attention to this phase of home mission work, both for the sake of the nation and for that of the immigrant himself. It is the national insurance against anarchy.

Illiteracy needlessly complicates every social problem. The first requisite for a democracy is an educated, not only an intelligent people. The Chinese are intelligent, but utterly uneducated. So are the people of India. It is idle to hope for any extension among these people of the democracy we enjoy so long as they can neither read or write. Popular education is essential to every social, political, economic and religious advance.

In these facts is seen the necessity for the Interchurch program of educational missionary work both in the home and in the foreign field.

The best the church can do in this respect abroad is to train the native leadership of the future.

3. *It is a starving world.* Owing to the lack of modern methods and efficient governmental encouragement most Oriental countries—and many European lands as well—are always just at the starvation point. They are quite capable of economic self-sufficiency but are handicapped by the persistent anemia of public spirit and proper leadership. China and India are rich in natural resources but poor in the efficient development and management of them. Work like that carried on at Allahabad by Sam Higginbottom is an object lesson of what can be done by the church to overcome the inertia of public spirit in an Oriental land. This lack of material development naturally puts an extra burden upon the shoulders of the rest of the world.

4. *It is a selfish world.* The World War was a classic example of the principle of national selfishness running amuck. The attitude of many of the nations at the Peace Conference was another exhibition of the same spirit.

Modern business will remain selfish unless and until it is ruled by the principles of Jesus Christ. The only remedy is the Christian gospel teaching the brotherhood of man as the direct result of the revelation of the fatherhood of God disclosed perfectly only by and through Jesus Christ.

5. *It is a divided world.* The world is divided racially, geographically, politically and religiously. Racial differences can be modified; geographical difficulties can be overcome; political differences can be composed, and religious differences can be brought into agreement only through the spread of the principles of the gospel of Christ.

Comity and cooperation are growing in favor in the foreign missionary field. It must be recognized in the home field as well. And since this great ideal is being pushed by the best and most unselfish peoples on the earth the influ-

ence of this spirit is bound to react on all other forms of human endeavor.

In view of these and many other obvious facts, it is imperative that the whole Christian church unite in an attempt to do at least what is humanly possible to solve the tremendous problems involved in world reconstruction—

First: Because despite all their faults and failings—the members of the Christian church represent that part of human society that at least is trying to maintain the right relationship with God and with humanity.

Second: Because the questions involved are fundamentally religious. The brotherhood of man is distinctly a religious ideal springing out of the Christian conception of the fatherhood of God. Brotherhood includes the consideration of every human relationship — religious, social, humanitarian, industrial, economic and political—where politics enters into any of these relationships and affects them adversely. "Above all nations is humanity."

Third: Because no agency but the Christian church can or does successfully operate internationally in the field of morals and humanitarian endeavor. Political governments cannot so operate,—being prevented by diplomatic and other obvious reasons from so doing. The most they can do is to preserve a decent, moral neutrality. Neither can business so operate, because of the suspicion of ulterior motives, even though of a benevolent origin and beneficient intent.

Fourth: Because no other agency is or can be so utterly unselfish or so completely disinterested as the Christian church. She has proved this beyond peradventure. She will make nothing by her adventure; millions will be sunk in it; great material opportunities will be uncovered by it; countless lives will be lost in it; but untold human betterment will assuredly result from it, and the church will be amply re-

paid by having helped to achieve this—the goal of all endeavors.

Fifth: Because world reconstruction on a Christian basis is imperative in order to save civilization from certain destruction. The church alone can do this, and do it she must without delay.

Now as to the very definite things that must be done and which the Interchurch World Movement is already doing in part:

First: It has conducted and still is conducting surveys at home and abroad; at home, in every state, county and community; abroad, in every country and among all nations, races and tribes. Its aim is to ascertain the facts relating to every sort of church and parochial activity; education, secular and religious; missionary needs; ministerial support and relief and medical care; hospitals and homes; industry, industrial relations and every other material fact concerning conditions in the field as they touch Christianity.

Second: Upon the results of these surveys, policies have been formulated and budgets framed to promote the greatest extension, the utmost efficiency and most practical economy. The policies provide for the greatest missionary comity and the utmost provision for all unappropriated areas in order to secure a truly world-wide occupation in the name of religion of the No Man's Land of spiritual conquest wherever found.

Third: The united budgets have been framed to meet the needs disclosed by the surveys for a period of at least five succeeding years. They have been approved by a Board of Review representing each constituent member of the Interchurch World Movement and adopted only after the most thorough expert scrutiny and care. Then will follow the united financial appeal to the whole country, April 21-May

2, 1920. The World Survey Conference at Atlantic City, January 7-10 attended by 1,700 delegates considered a tentative united budget for five years for over a billion dollars.

In the carrying out of the Interchurch World Movement campaign various departments are now functioning to take the message to the last member of the local church by means of meetings, conferences, conventions, addresses, lectures, exhibits, pageants, posters, lantern slides, motion pictures, and other features of graphic publicity; by newspaper and magazine publicity; by libraries; by missionary literature; by periodicals issued by the Movement itself; by the promotion of the widest and completest stewardship of personality; by development of every spiritual resource; by life service for vocational guidance and training.

The Concordat and After

Rev. William Whiting Davis

A MISCHIEVOUS child with a handful of gravel can injure, perhaps wreck a powerful engine. So the proposal called the Concordat, though we may think it childishly unwise, may injure and set back a very great and important movement towards reunion. There is in the world today such a large, legitimate and thoughtful movement. The Concordat does not deserve to be reckoned a part of that movement. It is an unconsidered attempt to do suddenly on a small and undignified scale the thing which multitudes of wise and good men are laboring in prayer and patience to accomplish after many days.

"No theologian of the Church can show a single point in which the proposed Concordat violates any principle of

Faith" — "An approach to Unity which does not sacrifice any principle of Faith or Order." This is the challenge—an amazing challenge—but a safe one for the challenger—safe as houses. That, perhaps, is why it is so often and so defiantly repeated. The old familiar colloquy runs thus:

Challenger: "No theologian of the Church, etc."

Opponent: "Here are a half-dozen theologians of the Church who find the following points, etc."

Challenger: "Ah, but I do not recognize your half-dozen theologians, etc."

It is an easy game! But fortunately two can play at it.

Opponent to Concordat: "No theologian of the Church can show a single point in which the Concordat does not violate, etc."

Proponent of Concordat: "Here are half a dozen theologians, etc."

Opponent: "Ah, but I do not recognize, etc."

And there you are!

Of course, as a matter of fact, there are a dozen theologians of the Church who will easily find many points in the Concordat which violate and sacrifice Faith and Order. The theologians are only waiting to get their tools ready.

But how much, after all, have the theologians to do with it? Can such a matter be adjudicated and settled by any number of theologians? This is not merely a matter of theology. The Holy Spirit does not speak only through theologians. They do not create the revelation of God, nor do they alone preserve the tradition. The matter of Faith and Order is one in which the whole Church is concerned. To narrow it down to the question as to whether a theologian, or several theologians, or all the theologians, can find "points" is mere "piffle before the wind."

The question is as big as the Church and as big as the

whole of Church history. The theologians of the Church will have rare sport for the next three years tracking down and covering up points — meanwhile, Faith and Order are facts. Let the theologians harry the field — as they will delight to do, but let the faithful consider some of the practical results of Concordat.

Let us, as a matter of courtesy, think a little bit about the Congregationalists, for after all, they are presumed to be interested. The Congregational Church is a very intelligent, cultivated, pious and most respected body of Christians. They deserve to be considered. Has that Congregational Church, as a body, asked for Orders? No. Has any authoritative Convention or Council of Congregationalists asked for Orders? No. Who has? We are told that two Congregational ministers, with perhaps the backing of a few congregations have asked for Orders. Have even these few asked for Orders as we understand the meaning of Orders? No. They ask for a sort of modified priesthood.

Now is it fair to the great and venerable Congregational Church for our General Convention to consider such a request presented in this way? Is it neighborly? Is it dignified? Is it polite for our General Convention to seize upon the request of a few dissatisfied ministers and propose to inject into the life and tradition of the Congregational Church our Orders, or some modification of our Orders, when the Congregational Church has not, through its National Council, asked us to do so? Isn't is a bit uncharitable — not to say "cheeky"? Suppose a farmer has a flourishing orchard of russets for which he has a large demand from satisfied customers. Suppose his neighbor, who raises pippins, induces the russet-grower's hired man, without his employer's consent, to graft a few dozen trees with pippin stock. Would it be a good excuse for the benevolent neighbor to

say, "But pippin is a better stock. You really ought to grow pippins."

But suppose such limited Orders to be really taken by a few Congregational ministers: what is likely to be the result? Well, in the first place, the Congregationalist will immediately have that tiresome thing — a "High Church party." Episcopal high and low Churchmen know what it all means and what it has meant among us for generations. We, perhaps, are getting to the point where we can endure it. Do we propose to fling this scrambling, fighting creature into the fold of the peaceful Congregationalists? Will they thank us? Will they think that *that* is a good bid for Reunion?

And these few Congregational ministers-priests, having attained their desire, against the judgment of most of their brethren, — will they be happy and useful proponents of Faith and Order? Not much! They will be considered as prigs, or pariahs, or parasites, or propogandists. And what will they do with their double allegiance — on one side to a Church which believes that the ministry comes from God and on the other side to a Church which believes that its ministry comes from the people. What kind of an idea will the majority of the Congregational faithful have of the Priesthood? Will they easily accept it as something superior to their own ministry? Or will they think of it as a pleasant and respectable, but wholly unnecessary, adornment of their ministers ? Will Catholic priesthood and Congregational ministers gradually merge into one another? Is that the hope? There will certainly be a good deal of merging and the likely result will be that in fifty years nobody will be able to tell who among the Congregational clergy is validly ordained. And will they be content forever to go to Catholic bishops for ordination? Did the Wesley-

ans? Have others who in past history received this sort of ordination? No: soon we shall have Congregational bishops. Probably that is the pleasing hope of the proponents of the Concordat.

Now, then, we visualize the Congregational ministry of the next generation as a mixture of good old-fashioned Protestant parsons and true priests and clergy of mottled ancestry. What will be the bewilderment of the people of the Congregational Church? They now have everything to say about who shall be ordained and where he shall minister and how he shall minister. In a few years many of our Congregational brethren will be robbed of that which they now esteem most highly. If it were certain that valid Orders would be preserved and that the priesthood would be honored, and that eventually all the ministers would become priests and all the people believe in the sanctity of Orders, perhaps there might be a sort of heavy, logical satisfaction in the prospect. But even so, would not the method of its accomplishment savor of that kind of practice which years ago used to be called Jesuitical?

Teaching is supposed to go with the priesthood. What kind of teaching will be given by the two newly ordained Congregational priests and others like them? There seems to be no provision in the Concordat for that. True, some of our own priests are not strictly orthodox teachers. But, do we like it? Do we like it well enough to pass it on to the Congregationalists? With us the unorthodox priest is rebuked by the Prayer Book and by the better knowledge of many of his people, and he sooner or later comes to grief. If the Congregational priest preaches Congregationalism he is untrue to his Episcopal ordination vows; if he preaches Catholic truth he will astonish and confound and enrage his people. He will be damned either way.

Having no Prayer-Book and no assigned liturgy how will the Congregational priest celebrate the Holy Mysteries? Except for the words of Institution he may say and do anything he chooses. Of course he is to be in some loose sense under one of our bishops. But Canon Law, liturgical use, ceremonial tradition, and all the high and holy wonders of the Blessed Eucharist mean nothing to him — unless he is a very rare and peculiar Congregational minister — such as may be imagined but never seen. And so — practically the Congregational priest can and will do as he likes. He can use any sort of elements. He can use any sort of liturgical acts. He can do without any kind of priestly vestments. He can communicate the people in any fashion. He will, perhaps, choose that abomination of irreverence the individual communion cup which, we understand, is in most congregations, left in the pew after the service. All this and more he can and will do and probably the dear man will never know he is doing anything wrong.

But what kind of a notion will the Congregationalist worshippers, especially the younger ones, have of the Mass? Is it a thing which we, as a national Church, or a small section of the Catholic Church, have any right to fling about in such a careless fashion? For the fault will be ours not that of the Congregationalist priest. We have given him that which we had no right to give on such terms.

And, moreover, liturgies, ceremonies, prayers, such as must accompany any sort of Celebration of the Mass, have a teaching quality. Sometimes they are more moving than the sermon. And they teach either truth or falsehood. They may also suppress truth or falsehood.

Think of all the tender, precious things which we get from the Mass in the way of doctrine and worship, such as the Real Presence, the actual communion, adoration, the

Communion of Saints, consolation in bereavement, intercession for the dead. Again, all this may become a highly valued privilege of the Episcopal-Congregationalist but it will be through the kind of miracle which we, as unfaithful stewards of the mysteries, would have no right to expect.

Habitual worship and communion of this irregular sort will certainly produce irregularities of discipline. Let us not speak at length of fasting communion. Still less of confession!

Of course we must add to all these forms of confusion in the Congregational Church in America the same confusion extended to all its branches in other lands, and to all its missionary field. We must also bring up the vision of nice, active and edifying contentions between Church missionaries and Congregational missionaries. Congregational ministers frequently officiate in Presbyterian and other Protestant congregations. They are sometimes called as pastors of such congregations. If one of the Concordat priests is so called upon to officiate occasionally or permanently, and he accepts, he will, of course, take with him the character and functions of Holy Orders. To what discipline will he then be subject? What kind of people will he communicate? They must be baptized, the Concordat says. But what will be their knowledge about the Holy Communion? What their readiness to be confirmed? What will the authorities of the Protestant sects have to say about it?

Suppose — and wisdom really does now and then look ahead and suppose — suppose the Concordat is put through. Suppose it eventually proves a failure — the sort of failure which it so obviously and impudently invites: what will become of the wreck? What of the few forlorn Congregational priests? Of course they could come into the Church,

but — well, it is hard to be patient with the thing. There are so many grotesque and pathetic possibilities.

"Well," say the proponents, "let all these things happen, let worse things happen — if only we bring reunion a little nearer." No: that won't do. That is not a reply but an evasion. We have no leave to take any such gambler's chance with the sacred things of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Church. We have not the authority, all by ourselves, to do this thing.

Besides that, the promise of the Concordat, taken at its most optimistic estimate, no more resembles reunion than an onion resembles a star. What the Concordat hopes to accomplish is not in the same category with the noble, heaven-born idea of reunion. Reunion is to bring all Christians into one fold: this is to project confusion into a neighbor's flock. Reunion is to turn all the separated sheep towards the one Shepherd for guidance and nourishment: this is formally and complacently to recognize separation. Reunion is to invite and enfold any who will come within the Catholic Kingdom: this is to declare officially (and without authority) that an obedience which is purposely partial and deliberately limited and unavoidably tentative is as true as is a full and disciplined loyalty. Is there, then, no such thing as schism? Or is it true that when schism grows old and graceful we must forget its obstinacy? Are we likely in this way to lessen the consciousness of schism among Congregationalists?

And confirmation! One draws in his breath as he thinks of the casual way in which the Concordat disposes of this sacrament. "It is hoped that Confirmation will follow" — or some such phrase. Can anyone write a perhaps in big enough capitals to express the dubiety of this hope? And again, what authority have we — a little section of the

Church — to decide that this inviting opportunity presented by a handful of eager Congregationalists is the one heaven-sent occasion and emergency for abrogating the age-long tradition of the Catholic Church?

"It is," the proponents say, "an opportunity" — even, they say, "it is the greatest opportunity since the original disunity" — which it is not! Some remarks made by Herbert T. Andrews in "The Reunion Movement of the 17th Century" in the *Contemporary* for October, 1919, are pertinent here — indeed the whole article is singularly edifying at this point.

After reviewing the "movement" he has in view, Mr. Andrews summarizes the results, which are not encouraging for the projectors of the Concordat. "Some ecclesiastical antagonisms," he says, "seem to be irreconcilable." And speaking of one of the decisions of the English-Church he quotes a question which applies to the Episcopal Church in her present consideration of the Concordat. "What gain would it have been to the Church if it absorbed Non-conformity at one end of the scale only to create a new type of Non-conformity at the other?" "Opportunity" — perhaps one of the most disconcerting words to juggle with in the language. "Opportunity," for two Congregational ministers and several others to submit themselves humbly to the loving discipline and order of the Catholic Church — surely no strange thing in Christian history. "Opportunity," for the Protestant Episcopal Church to further relax her already rather loose discipline with no clear prospect of bringing those whom she rashly enriches with her Orders into even her present measure of discipline.

And, for a moment, let us look into a larger field. What of the other great portions of the Catholic Church, — the English Church, the Roman Catholic, the Eastern

Churches? There is no suggestion in the Concordat that these our friends are to be taken into partnership or even consulted about the matter. There is not the faintest shadow of a doubt as to how these great, *predo minant* Catholic Churches will look upon the Concordat. We hate to think of the sadness, disappointment — we dare to say, the righteous disgust which they will feel if we do this hasty, unconsidered thing; for it is really charitable to say unconsidered. If the proponents of the Concordat will say that it is a considered deliberate thing, then it is a thousand times worse than we thought. Let us then leave it as unconsidered, hoping that we are not victims of a too generous delusion.

The Eucharist as a Memorial of the Resurrection

Rev. H. C. Ackerman.

THE central significance of the Incarnation from the point of view of the regeneration and sanctification of human nature is that of a continuing sacrificial agency. The death of Christ is a miraculous event contingent to the sacrificial principle operative in the divine system of salvation as a whole. The death itself is central in the system, but, for all that, constituting one element among many, albeit the chief element, to which all other sacrificial elements converge and in which they find their ultimate consummation. In other words, the Incarnation in its totality was and is of a sacrificial nature in addition to the cross as its principal feature, for the very fact of God becoming man involved real factors of sacrifice and the human experience of

God on earth in the person of Christ may not be construed as other than sacrificial in their import.

The resurrection, then, being a part, the conclusive part,[1] of the saving instrumentalities of the Incarnation, certainly is continuous with, and consummates, the running sacrificial principle as a whole. That is to say, the sacrificial element does not terminate with the cross, but is carried along to and in the resurrection. It is even extended to the ascension and into the dispensation of the Holy Ghost, but this point is not pertinent to the following discussion. What I wish to maintain is simply the continuity of the sacrificial element, an element or factor immanent in the redemptive process of the Incarnation as a whole, between the cross and the empty tomb. This much by way of introduction to the thesis I wish to present.

Now, naturally, the Eucharist is recognized as a memorial of our Lord's death — "as often as you do this, you do show forth the Lord's death . . . . "; "This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me." This all-prevailing conception is too firmly established to need amplification or comment and I would remark at the outset that it is far from my purpose to substitute any other notion in its place, but I believe that it may be qualified or supplemented by a further conception which I would like to bring out and emphasize in this paper, a conception if not more final, certainly more inclusive, namely, the Eucharist, or Mass-sacrifice, as a memorial of Christ's resurrection. Or, to put it more soundly perhaps, the Eucharist is a memorial in which the resurrection is one of the elements memorialized. I think there is something inspiring in this latter idea which is in a measure obscured by the (all-valid) emphasis laid upon the former, and because of this over-

[1] If we except the dispensation of the Spirit.

shadowing of the notion of life by that of death, with detriment to the former. Any sacrifice, and especially the sacrifice *par excellence* of the cross, when once accomplished becomes henceforth a persistent element in the life of the person who experiences it; or, better, true sacrifice is never an isolated act or event, but rather a permanent principle of action, constantly determining the character of the life in which the sacrificial factor is involved.

I undertake to contend for the suggested thesis, being persuaded that the advantages that will accrue from as complete and accurate a purview of the meaning of the great Christian act of devotion as is possible will be exceedingly great, not only through the removal of certain long-persisting prejudices against the incomplete or partial theories of the sacrificial character of the altar worship of the Church, but also because the idea of a living Christ, showing forth in victorious manner his *life* of sacrifice even beyond the point of death is the supreme appeal which the Christian religion makes to the worshiping world for regeneration unto personal righteousness.

The substance of the truth I hope to present with some telling logic is based upon a passage in Romans 4:25, — "Who . . . . was raised again for our justification," or, according to Moffatt's translation, "Who . . . . was raised that we might be justified."[2] This may be paraphrased in other words, "For Jesus 'was given up to death to atone for our offenses,' and was raised to life that we might be pronounced righteous."[3] The point that is suggested here is that justification as a process of divine working is inclusive of the atonement in a way in which the atonement cannot be said to be inclusive of justification. This is no new idea,

[2] James Moffat, *The New Testament,* Georeg H. Doran Co.
[3] *The Twentieth Century New Testament.*

but it may appear to some in a fresh light when it is stated that the justification of the resurrection is inclusive of the cross. I do not mean to imply that there is anything novel in the fact that the working efficiency of the resurrection is inclusive of the cross; I simply wish to bring out the idea that we are pronounced righteous by virtue of the resurrection. Now since we cannot separate our justification from the efficacy of the cross, we cannot likewise separate the justification obtained through the resurrection from the sacrifice of the cross. In a word, the resurrection signifies our justification in continuity with the atonement wrought on the cross. This is sound, and certainly is nothing original to assert; but I wish to suggest that the sacrificial character of the Mass-worship may be related to the Eucharistic memorial of the resurrection in a manner which I shall proceed to set forth. The two ideas, the sacrificial memorial and the memorial of the resurrection (the matter of my thesis) may be tied together in the Eucharist. It is this coupling up of the resurrection with the memorial aspect of the Mass, a memorial which is unquestionably sacrificial, that makes up the matter I have in mind to explain. The thesis may be put tersely thus: The Eucharistic sacrifice is a memorial of the resurrection. This is not simply to assert that the Eucharist is a memorial of the resurrection, which goes without saying; but that the Eucharistic sacrifice is such a memorial. This is the point at issue.

It has been observed that the Incarnation, taken as a whole, is an act of sacrifice on God's part and in man's behalf. The sacrificial principle then extends through the resurrection, and as the Eucharist memorializes this unity or continuity of sacrifice it over-reaches the cross and extends into the resurrection; that is to say, the memorial of the altar objectifies in the sacred rite more than the death

upon the cross: it expresses the resurrection also *in a sacrificial light.* The redemptive meaning of the cross does not preclude the justification of the resurrection.[4]

To see this significance of the altar worship is to make Christ's sacrifice more a matter of life fundamentally than of death, or a life inclusive of and transcending mere death. This is not to underrate the death-factor in the Eucharist, but to bring out into fuller perfection the life-factor. It means a shifting of the center of spiritual gravity from the point of death to a plane of life in a manner which illuminates death as transition rather than an end in itself. It is the living Christ which portrays, perforce, the nature of Christian death and portrays and defines its meaning in terms of sacrifice. When our Lord said to his disciples, "This do for my memorial" he instituted a memorial of sacrifice, a memorial of His life at large, so to speak; and though the action is performed more directly in relation to the cross than to any other act of sacrifice, still it is relative, in a wider sense, to His life as a whole, a life altogether sacrificial. Why then limit the relation exclusively to the cross? The institution is a memorial of Him ("*me*")—not simply a commemoration of His death *only.*

I hope to make my meaning clearer in the development of the thesis. First, in holding the Christian Sunday as a memorial of the resurrection, as every sabbath is a memorial of the Easter sabbath, it is not the day itself which in reality memorializes the resurrection of our Lord, but the distinctive service of the day, namely, the Eucharist. It is obviously the service which sanctifies the day rather than the day which sanctifies and makes significant the act of worship performed on that day. Therefore, not Sunday so much as the service of worship performed on that day is the

[4] *Cf.* Romans 4:25, cited *ante.*

essential memorial. That is to say, it is patently the Eucharist itself in which the memorial centers. Now to assert that the "day" is the memorial of the resurrection and the service of the day (the Mass-sacrifice) is the memorial of the cross and to tie these two conceptions together is hardly to do justice to the meaning of either. The two conceptions must be unified, must be seen as one. We may accomplish this result by looking upon the Eucharist itself as *a memorial of the resurrection.* This is the thought I am attempting to clarify and emphasize.

To revert to Old Testament precendents, we may consider the shifting points of view involved in the idea of a memorial. The name of God revealed to Moses at Horeb, Jehovah (Yahweh), was to be a memorial in Israel for all generations.[5] The name involved a mystery, but a mystery in some manner revealed. Literally the name meant "I will become" or "he will become."[6] That is to say, God would manifest himself *phenomenally* in some (remarkable) manner. The point is the phenomenal "becoming" or manifestation. Carrying the line of God's manifestations down through Israel to Christ, it is possible to see in the cross a phenomenal manifestation of God and in the resurrection as well. The announcement, then, contained in the name revealed to Moses we may see fulfilled in an illuminating way in our Lord's death and resurrection. God's becoming man, in suffering and sacrifice and in a triumphant resurrection logically carried out the initial Mosaic idea of the divine "becoming" or phenomenal manifestation. Here in the beginning, at the time of the Mosaic covenant, was the idea of a memorial set forth, a memorial of a progressive and continuous character.

---

[5] Exodus 3:15*b*.
[6] Exodus 3:14.

Again, in the exodus itself the memorial conception is expressed. "This day shall be unto you a memorial";[7] that is to say, the feast of unleavened bread in conjunction with the Passover celebration should be observed to commemorate the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. The notion of freedom from an economic and political tyranny is transformed in the Christian continuity, where the Eucharist becomes the Church's Passover feast, to a view of freedom from the moral and spiritual tyranny of sin. The Passover-Eucharistic memorial commemorates a God-given freedom, a freedom first interpreted in political terms and secondly in moral and spiritual terms. The fact then that the Hebrew Passover is a prototype of the Christian Eucharist fixes the meaning of the Eucharist in line with the atonement of the cross, but it also reveals the additional truth that the Eucharist is connected up with the idea of freedom or spiritual emancipation since it was our Lord's resurrection from the dead which manifested his complete victory over the enslaving powers of sin and death. Thus the memorial of the altar is more than a memorial of the cross; it is also a memorial of the resurrection in as much as the resurrection reveals the actual fact of freedom from tyranny of sin. By looking upon the resurrection, therefore, in a line of progression with the Passover, which is a memorial of deliverance, we can see in the altar-memorial of the cross the larger and more inclusive memorial of the resurrection, *i. e.*, the memorial of the victory of life over death. While we recognize then that the Mass-service is a memorial of the cross, it is also possible to see in this same sacrificial element a memorial of the resurrection. But the double memorial conception is not simply a commemoration of the atonement plus the commemoration of the resurrec-

[7] Exodus 12:14.

tion (or freedom from the grave) only loosely joined together; as a matter of course, the dual conception may be monistically based on the underlying and fundamental sacrificial principle.

To repeat: the gist of our argument, which seeks to prove that the Holy Eucharist is a memorial of the resurrection (as well as a memorial of the cross), lies in the fact that the cross and the Passover are closely associated, and the resurrection and the Passover are closely associated. The Passover is the common element in both relations. Now since the Passover is obviously a memorial of deliverance from slavery of some kind and the Eucharistic memorial is likewise a commemoration of a deliverance from the slavery of sin and death, it follows that the Mass-service memorializes the spiritual emancipation of mankind. But the Mass-service is unquestionable sacrificial in character. Therefore there must be some valid relation of the sacrificial element in the Mass-service to the resurrection. This is the point we seek to press.

The central truth of the resurrection is essentially a practical rather than a theological doctrine. This truth is of course doctrinized and I do not mean to imply that the Faith as a whole, systematized and completed in catholic fulness and integrity does not rest primarily upon the doctrine of the rising of Christ from the dead. It does beyond dispute. I refer to the emphasis that is laid upon the resurrection in the teaching of the Church from the beginning until now. This is set forth with special clearness in the Prayer Book epistle and gospel together with the collects for the day. Note the practical turn of thought: "Seek those things which are above"; "mortify your members"; "die daily from sin," *etc.* This note of becoming righteous is unfortunately blurred over by the very glory of the miracle it-

self. The wonder of this conquest over death obscures in a large measure the conquest over sin and unrighteousness. The beauty of the Easter service, the flowers, the music, the spring joy, the spiritual exaltation at what is so sublime and transcendent in the resurrection tends to overshadow the more commonplace but vital note, namely, the practical righteousness of the living, risen Lord. To be carried away emotionally (and one would not reprove this natural spontaneous outburst of happiness) does nevertheless to some degree becloud just that point of the reformed righteousness of living which is especially emphasized by the Church teaching for Easter day. And this is the prosaic duty of participating personally in the righteousness of Christ, celestially pure and holy, by means of the sacramental powers that become ours by virtue of the victory of righteousness over sin, the penalty of which *was* death. In fine, the resurrection demonstrates not primarily an immortality but an immortality of goodness. It is goodness that survives the destructive forces of evil in the world. The good Life may now bravely proclaim, "O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?"

What I am driving at will now, I think, become apparent. From the practical aspects of the resurrection, so conspicuously and forcibly accented on Easter day in the Eucharistic memorial, we may conclude, consistent with our thesis, that the Mass-service in so far as it presents efficaciously the manner and means to righteousness is essentially a memorial of life triumphant over death and this life is in the *dying yet risen* Lord. The ultimate idea, then, of the Eucharist is certainly that of life: that kind of life, however, *which exemplifies a sacrificial principle.* In the last analysis, it is not life alone victorious over death, but it is *sacrificial life* triumphant in death, that the Mass-memorial

memorializes. On the Christian altar it is the *life* of sacrifice to the point of death *and beyond* (resurrected) that is upheld in priestly oblation.

Furthermore, we are always beset with the difficulty that the rite of Maundy Thursday was a valid Eucharist *before* the actual death of Christ upon the cross, a difficulty, however, that vanishes when the sacrifice contemplated is considered as a dynamic principle rather than an isolated act. In the bread and wine blessed and consecrated then, in the upper chamber, on the eve of the betrayal, there was presented to God the Father a real sacrifice, identical with the altar-sacrifice which commemorates continuously the atoning sacrifice of Calvary, a sacrifice (*i. e.*, the altar-sacrifice) actually performed subsequent to the death upon the cross. In *both* instances, before and after the death itself, the crowning act of our Lord was and is presented to God; but can we deny that this supreme act includes all the sacrificial relations leading to and following from it? The significance of this lies in the fact that it is the living Christ objectively manifesting His death, first by way of anticipation and second by way of retrospection. The conclusion is patent: the memorial is a dynamic, not a static, memorial, centering in life, albeit a sacrificial life coterminous with the Incarnation.

It may be added that the "memorial" does not imply a relation to the past (like mere memory) exclusively; it is inclusive of both a forward and a backward relation. Now there is no looking forward to death as an end, but rather to life as the ultimate reality, or, to be more accurate, a life extending the principle of sacrifice eternally.

Also the Eucharist is more the bringing of the cross into the *present* (a continuation of Calvary) than simply a representation or memorialization (literally) of a past act.

This, I believe, is the true, i. e. the catholic doctrine. Since then it is the living Christ primarily who shews forth His death, or, better, who shews forth His life-in-death, His sacrificial life, as a whole, the finality of the propitiating act of Christ is not centralized and unified in the death of the cross so truly as it is sustained perpetually in the Christ alive, or in the resurrected Lord whose death constitutes but one point, admittedly the significant one, in His whole earthly existence. In other words, the Eucharist manifests the Christ alive, the Christ of the resurrection primarily, inclusive of the Christ of the cross, to be sure, but more by way of qualification than by limitation,—the saving Christ who objectively reveals to the eye of faith a crucified human nature, which in living dies, *but more, in dying lives.* His blood therefore becomes like unto sparkling jewels, the piercing thorns, a crown of glory, and the wounded side the source whence flows the living waters to heal and by healing free mankind from the corrupting slavery of sin.

To recapitulate: the Eucharistic memorial is a memorial of the sacrificial life *par excellence.* Though death was materialized in the incarnate Son of God, this human submission to the penal results of sin was spiritualized, raised to a higher plane than that of natural mortality, even unto the supernatural life of the resurrection—that which is exactly objectified on the altar of the Church.

The advantages of seeing the memorial of the resurrection, when one looks deeply into the relational aspects of the death of the cross, in the Eucharistic sacrifice would seem to be apparent. Christ is raised in the oblation of the altar "that we might be justified" or pronounced righteous. To see in the glory of this supreme service of Christian devotion a living sacrificial principle objectified in our resurrected Lord and operative in His Church in the lives of the

faithful would, I believe, tend to remove many of the materialistic elements of the cross which to many sensitive souls do as a matter of course inhibit the spiritual elements memorialized in the ritual of the Mass-worship. To see in sacrificial worship a celebration of the historic religious drama of human nature *dying to sin* on the cross rather than simply *dying for sin* (though the mystery of the atonement is unquestionably involved in the sublime tragedy of the cross), I think would mean for many as yet outside the circle of the true initiate a great help in participating in the worship of the Church at the altar. The "day of the Lord" fulfilled and perpetuated in sacrificial worship is still a "day of darkness" rather than of light to many within the Church because the Mass idea is not connected up closely enough with the practical principle of righteousness which is in reality the predominating truth. By emphasizing the notion of justification in connection with the altar service and recognizing that mankind is justified in fact (not merely potentially) when men become actually righteous; and by pointing out that it is a life of sacrifice which is the real secret of righteousness and its causal source; in short, by seeing in the memorial of the sanctuary oblation a memorial of the resurrection with all that this implies in the way of being righteous and by righteousness overcoming the death of sin,—would not such a vision of our sacrificial Lord draw more of humanity to God's altar than an exclusive emphasis upon the isolated cross does at the present day?

I have tried in this discussion of the meaning of the altar memorial to suggest that the Eucharistic sacrifice is not only a memorial of the cross but of the resurrection. The value of the emotional potency of the cross for true religion cannot be overestimated; but the nice vision which sees the

principle of sacrifice running throughout the Incarnation as a whole and finding its climax in the resurrection, without centering in the cross in such a manner as to cut the functioning of the principle unduly short, would seem, in my judgment, to illuminate the memorial-worship of the Church by the factor of justification, which is righteousness, more than is possible by eliminating or depreciating the practical bearing of the altar devotion upon the lives of the worshipers. At any rate, if there is real weight in such a suggestion I leave it with the reader. At bottom, we are saved by Christ's life, not hy His death alone. This is indeed a truism. But if the truth can be expressed more eloquently by seeing in the rite of the altar a memorial of Christ's resurrection, the triumphant, emancipating principle of living sacrifice, which is creative of the Christian righteousness, brought to the forefront in our devotion, would not this larger vision of the Eucharist win over more souls to the Catholic Faith? That such a conception is absent from "inner circles" I would not imply; that it may spread to larger circles is the primary object of this paper.

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians

Rev. Fleming James, Ph.D.

THIS is in some ways the hardest book of the Bible to follow through understandingly: not that the ideas in it are obscure, but their employment. And yet it is one of the most important writings of the New Testament for the Christian life, not only because it handles truths of the utmost value but also by reason of the peculiar literary vehicle through which these are conveyed. For this is a piece of autobiography, revealing the very heart of St. Paul so that when once understood it binds forever together in the reader's memory the truths it teaches with the man who learned them by living.

Our aim, then, will be first to reconstruct the situation in which it was written; then when that is done as surely as possible out of the existing material, to see how St. Paul meets it in the epistle. This will necessitate a cursory tracing of his thought throughout the entire letter. Finally, we may inquire what is the special value of this book as applied to the needs of the present day.

The Past Relations of St. Paul and the Corinthians.

Acts 18:1-18 tells how St. Paul brought the gospel to Corinth, but reveals nothing of his dealings with the members of that infant church. Next, we have for our information the First Epistle to the Corinthians written after he had left Corinth, probably from Ephesus, which throws a flood of light upon the problems he had to meet with these new converts. We cannot go into the matters there treated in any detail, but certain facts must be noted as leading up

to the situation revealed in Second Corinthians. It is plain that the Corinthians were very worldly in their way of estimating their religious leaders. They prized superficial and showy abilities above real efficiency. Eloquence and a brilliant mind—as they accounted these—made much more impression on them than the plain preaching of the truth as it is in Jesus, though accompanied by the operation of God's Spirit in works of power and altered lives. The result was personal followings—a splitting up of the congregations into groups favoring different leaders, taking pride in their individual preferences and looking down upon those who disagreed with them as people of inferior taste. This naturally involved in many minds a disparagement of St. Paul himself; for he had made it a point to exhibit none of those surface attractions that were coming more and more to be in demand among them. In First Corinthians we see him addressing himself to this disparagement, by insisting that they adhere to the true standards in estimating him and those set up in contrast to him.

Now his tone throughout the First Epistle betokens the confidence of an acknowledged position. Notwithstanding their tendency to overprize other leaders the Corinthians do not seem to question seriously his authority. At least he feels that they do not, and consequently he displays no agitation. Though in places breaking into irony, severity and even threats, he is at bottom sure of his standing with them.

Another thing in the background of the First Epistle is his intention of returning to Corinth very soon. This gives a point to several passages, especially that in which he threatens on his arrival to deal severely with them in case they do not meanwhile amend (4:18). At the same time his fundamental confidence in their loyalty seems on the

whole to have made him look forward to the proposed visit with pleasure. It is in a thoroughly friendly way that he tells them his plans regarding it (16:5-9).

Between the sending of First Corinthians and the writing of Second Corinthians events occurred that altered all this and compelled St. Paul to fight for the very existence of his authority. The course of these events it is hard to trace accurately but their general drift is plain.

Not long after the sending of First Corinthians bad news reached St. Paul from Corinth. Very possibly Timothy was his informant, for in First Corinthians St. Paul speaks of him as about to visit the church there. It is significant that this visit is not alluded to in Second Corinthians and the reason for not speaking of it is usually thought to be that it proved an unhappy one. If so, St. Paul's fears that when Timothy got to Corinth he might be treated with scant respect[1] were more than realized. For the behavior of the people showed that they held in contempt not Timothy only but St. Paul himself. In particular, one person in the congregation had committed against the apostle an act of flagrant wrong which brought matters to a crisis.

It was then that he penned a letter which he himself later described as coming "out of much affliction and anguish of heart with many tears."[2] What he said was in effect this:[3] He would not again in pain come to them. If they continued to act as at present his visit would have to be punitive; and such a visit he could not endure to make. "For if I hurt you, who is he that maketh me glad, but he that is hurt by me?" There was also in the letter the demand, expressed or implied, that they clear themselves by taking

[1] 1 Cor. 16:11.
[2] 2 Cor. 2:4.
[3] 2 Cor. 2:3. "I wrote this very thing," i. e. what precedes.

action against the offensive person—if they expected to see St. Paul again! It was apparently something very like an ultimatum that he sent.

Titus was its bearer, chosen probably as the man most likely to get results. When he had set out St. Paul's heart failed him and he wished he had not written the letter.[4] It would give pain, he knew, and had indeed counted on that for its effectiveness. Deep within him lay the confidence that they did love him; that if he did bare his bosom to them and let his love make a supreme demand upon them, they would respond. But suppose they did not! Suppose the pain he caused were not to be "godly pain" but "worldly." Then the damage they would have received from him would be terrible.

At last it was time for Titus to return and St. Paul went to Troas on missionary business expecting to meet him there. But he had not come. The agony of apprehension was more than he could endure; and so turning his back upon the promising opportunity opening to him in Troas St. Paul went on into Macedonia to meet his delayed emissary. Still no Titus! The distracted apostle could find no relief. Some external conflicts were added to his inward anxiety to make him wholly miserable.

And then at last Titus came! His happy face was the herald of good news.[5] For the Corinthians (he recounted joyfully) had received him with fear and trembling. St. Paul's letter had indeed thrown them into a transport of pain, but it was of the godly sort. In a wave of repentance they had done everything to acquit themselves in the matter. Longing for St. Paul and earnest desire to set themselves right with him mingled with fear of losing him and

[4] 2 Cor. 7:8.
[5] 8 Cor. 7:13.

anger at the one whose injury had caused the trouble. The offender had been brought to justice and a penalty inflicted on him by a vote of the majority.

Titus had no doubt stayed in Corinth long enough to take advantage of the turn of the tide and put affairs there on as firm a basis as possible. One of the matters he would urge upon them would be the collection for the poor at Jerusalem, a project peculiarly dear to St. Paul's heart.[6]

After that meeting — what? All we know is gathered from the next letter written by St. Paul to the Corinthians—our "Second Epistle." In it the happy events connected with Titus' arrival in Corinth are already a thing of the past. A reaction unfavorable to St. Paul has set in and the situation, though by no means so critical as before, is certainly far from satisfactory. We cannot learn just when this letter was written. A common view is that at least chapters 1-9 were sent back by the hand of Titus almost immediately after he had met St. Paul in Macedonia. If so, he had brought to St. Paul sad news as well as glad. He had stayed in Corinth long enough to witness the beginnings of the reaction. My own feeling is that some time intervened after that meeting before Second Corinthians was sent. St. Paul I believe went back to Asia and there fell desperately ill:[7] only after his recovery did he conclude that he must dispatch Titus once more to Corinth with a strong letter.

The Situation to which the Epistle is Addressed.

Some men who claimed to be apostles and had brought letters of commendation to the Corinthian church from elsewhere were openly depreciating St. Paul and seeking to

[6] 2 Cor. 8:6—though this may not refer to the "bounty" but have only general significance.

[7] 2 Cor. 18 ff. I take it that the illness is quite recent at the time of writing.

discredit him altogether. We gather that their attacks on him rested on the following items:

1. He is not a genuine apostle, or he would insist upon the apostle's right to be supported by you.[8]

2. He makes a great boast of his disinterestedness in thus not taking anything of you, but that is only a pretence. He has some ulterior purpose—depend upon it![9]

3. This boasting of which his letters are full, is an obsession with him: he is mad—"beside himself"—with conceit.[10]

4. He is also very bold towards your faults—when he is absent:[11] he can write—weighty and strong letters—from a distance. But when you get him face to face what is he? Weak. And when he tries to speak instead of write, it is contemptible nothing.[12] In fact, he is afraid of you. Did he not tell you a while ago that he was coming here? Some said then he would not come. Well, did he? No, he sent a letter instead! That is his character: light, shifty, with no determination or weight. Now "yea, yea," now "nay, nay."[13]

5. Yes, in a word, he has no weight! He is poor-spirited[14] and of no account. Only look at him—a miserable sickly fellow, with one foot in the grave.[15] No culture, no power of expression![16] What does he know? Who can make any-

---

[8] The second clause rests on an inference from 2 Cor. 11:7. It is not to be pressed. But there seems no doubt of the fact that St. Paul's genuineness was in question.

[9] Inferred from 2 Cor. 12:16.

[10] In chapters 11 and 12 "foolishness" seems to be the same as "glorying." The "beside ourselves" of 5:13 I suppose is to be interpreted in the same way.

[11] 2 Cor. 10:1.

[12] 2 Cor. 10:10.

[13] 2 Cor. 1:15 f—"fickleness" is "lightness" in Greek, akin to the word used in 4:17.

[14] i. e. "lowly," 2 Cor. 10:1 and elsewhere.

[15] Inferred from 2 Cor. 4:7 ff.

[16] 2 Cor. 11:6, "rude in speech"—"in knowledge" (which he denies).

thing out of his gospel, as he calls it?[17] Why bother with him? Let him come and show how "Christ works in him," as he claims.[18]

Now these men (we can accept St. Paul's estimate of them) were not sincere. They cared nothing for the Corinthians, but only for what could be got out of them. And their conduct was certainly very different from the "humility" they ridiculed in St. Paul. They browbeat the people, insisting on their full financial rights as apostles, greedily taking everything they could seize. Nor were they by any means silent as to their own excellences, parading their claim to be treated as very special apostles because of their pure Jewish descent, their peculiar closeness to Christ, their visions and revelations and the like.[19]

All this influenced the Corinthians greatly. Much impressed, they submitted meekly enough to these "super-apostles," allowing them to carry things with a high hand.[19] The stronger the hold of the interlopers upon the Corinthians, the more they tended to drift away from St. Paul. Although in their hearts knowing his sincerity and seeing many flaws in the sneers of his opponents,[20], they yet remained silent before his critics.[21] To tell the truth, the sneers were having an effect upon them. For St. Paul was *not* impressive: he did not come up to the standards craved by their worldly natures. As a result they were growing cool towards him: their "affections were straightened."[22] In marked contrast with their meekness towards the self-assertive "super-apostles" they were inclined to be very

---

[17] Inferred from "But and if our gospel is veiled"—2 Cor. 4:3.
[18] 2 Cor. 13:3.
[19] Inferred from 2 Cor. 11:16 ff.
[20] 1 Cor. 1:13 and elsewhere.
[21] Inferred from 2 Cor. 5:12.
[22] 2 Cor. 6:12.

touchy at any show of his authority, and to resent any exhibition of his failings, such as "boastfulness" and "self-commendation."[23]

But that was not the worst of it. They were going wrong morally, their loyalty to *Christ* was being undermined. For these "super-apostles" were really bad men with vicious teaching, emissaries of Satan who appealed to the all too willing appetites of people but lately emerged from heathenism. Thus depreciation of St. Paul went along with a condoning and encouragement of evil to estrange the Corinthians not only from their true apostle but from God.[24] This was particularly the case with "many" who had been guilty of gross sin at a previous period and had never really repented. But "all the rest" were tainted in some degree.[25]

A specific instance of their coldness in religion was the way in which the offering for the Jerusalem poor was dragging. The year before they had taken the lead in generous promises and St. Paul had quoted them to the Macedonians as an example of liberality. But now that the time drew near to gather in the amounts raised, they were so far from redeeming their pledge that St. Paul felt it absolutely necessary to send Titus to Corinth to remedy the shameful condition.[26]

St. Paul's Task in View of this Situation.

When St. Paul therefore took pen in hand to write Second Corinthians he had to deal with a state of affairs at once grave and painful. Now the chief purpose for which he was writing was the same that he held before him in all his work: the "upbuilding" of these Christian people. They

[23] Thus I apprehend his tone in 2 Cor. 3:1 and elsewhere.
[24] 2 Cor. 6:14 ff, 11:3 and elsewhere.
[25] 2 Cor. 12:21, 13:2.
[26] Chapters 8 and 9.

were to be restored to right relations with God. This involved their break with the spurious apostles and their true apostle, St. Paul. In consequence, St. Paul must discredit his opponents and recall the Corinthians to an appreciation of himself. That would be open to misinterpretation as an *apologia* on his part; yet there was no escape from it. But more, he must enlarge their narrowed affections and dispel their coldness with a new warmth. He must rouse them from their sin by a fear that yet would not stifle a growing tenderness, and he must bring them in penitence back to God. He must, in particular, stir into flames the embers of their generosity. And with it all, he must meet any persistence in their present disloyalty with a sternness that would make them understand that he would endure no trifling.

Now St. Paul did not coldly calculate this; he felt it rather. For he himself wrote in a state of intense emotion. Love, indignation, joy, pain, ecstacies, groanings, melting tenderness, burning severity, biting irony, passionate pleading, sublime flights, tortured remonstrances — all crowd the pages of this epistle. Therefore he was the better able to compel their answering passion, even as he still compels our own.

It will be an epistle of contrasts. He must contrast on the one hand his opponents with himself and on the other hand himself as they misrepresent him with himself as he really is. The two ideas of what constitutes a true minister of Christ will clash in mortal combat, and St. Paul will enforce his own with all the eloquence at his command. By playing on one emotion after another he will undermine the resistence of his readers and sweep them onward to the climax of appeal: "Be ye reconciled to God . . . now!

Come ye out from among them . . . Make room for us." Then, as having them with him, he will lead up to the special matter of the offering for the Jerusalem poor. This done, by a sudden change of tone he will revert once more to the fundamental question of their loyalty — now with the stern determination to come to grips with his opponents and have it out. He will warn the Coninthians that if they do not make the immediate choice to which he has already lovingly urged them they will be dealt with as belonging to the enemy, when the day of reckoning comes; and come it will. Finally, with another abrupt transition, he will resume in brief closing words his former tenderness and leave them with his blessing.

In bringing out the necessary contrasts he will make several main points, for which the reader should be constantly on the look out.

1. He will insist again and again that he, so far from being dispirited, is bold, cheerful, confident. In spite of everything that ordinarily would depress a man, he overflows with vigor and courage. Why not? He has every reason for exhilaration and "boasting," though not in self, but in God. He is sure concerning himself, the glory of his ministry, his personal future; sure also of the Corinthians, though their present state is not the basis for that confidence; he finds it in the past, in his own love for them and in his faith in God concerning them.

2. He will admit freely that to the superficial observer he is "weak." The outward Paul, the Paul, according to the flesh, is *not* impressive. But this is not the *real* Paul. If one penetrate—as the Christians must—below the outward appearance to the self, he will find there no "weakness," no "lightness," but an increasing "weight of glory."

3. He will claim two things:

(1) *Sincerity*, utter and entire, making him at once their friend and the unobstructed channel of God's grace.

(2) *Power*. Because he thus puts himself wholly at God's disposal, God works through him with power. He gets results in the lives of others. In particular, the Corinthians are the living testimony of his effectiveness. This is the real test of an apostle; not what he claims to be in himself, but his fruits in his converts.

Here comes in St. Paul's characteristic view of his "weaknesses." Christ has revealed to him that these, instead of lessening his effectiveness, actually multiply it. "Death worketh in us but life in you." Therefore he is glad to embrace them; and if he must boast he will boast not "according to the flesh"—of outward impressiveness—but of the very things that seem to spoil his strength and usefulness; for these are the secret of his power.

In all this St. Paul's problem is to make them see the facts as he sees them on his level. They are below him. Much bulks large to them that is nothing to him; while what is large in his eyes is obscured from theirs. He must speak from their level enough to bring home facts to them, and yet at the same time hammer into their minds that it *is* a low level, that it does not dominate him.

One thing more. He frequently uses the plural "we," associating himself with Timothy and Silas, even where he is speaking of an individual experience like illness. There was a reason for this perhaps that Timothy especially stood for "weakness" in the minds of the Corinthians. But at times the singular breaks through and he stands solitary before them — he and they alone.

The Course of Thought in the Epistle.

Chap. 1 v. 1 Fresh from the triumph of a marvellous restoration to health he strikes at the very outset the note that is to be woven through the whole epistle. His main thoughts are crowded into the opening paragraph. Confidence, not in self but in God: God has delivered him and will deliver. The admission of weakness: we were desperately ill. Power towards others: "it is for you." Confidence again in *their* ultimate salvation. Confidence finally in their loyalty to him: they will in his future illnesses help by their prayers and join in thanks at his recovery.

12 The last thought furnishes the door-way through which he rushes at once to what is uppermost in his mind. Instead of going on (as we should expect from his introduction) to administer "comfort" to them in their afflictions he begins his self-vindication.

He has confidence in their loyalty for we are proudly sure of our claim on you — our sincerity. You admit it (you must). I hope you will always acknowledge it; as you did (in the past) *partly* acknowledge us personally that we are your glorying."

15 There follows the explanation that his change of plan coming was due not to "lightness" (as they were imagining) but to his very confidence. He was so sure of his authority with them that under the changed circumstances (the news of their disobedience) he was afraid for *them* if he came. *They* would have been "hurled down," not he! And that Chap. 2 v. 1 he could not bear! (For he loved them, had joy only in their joy).

3 He next explains why he wrote as he did: not to give them pain, but that his great love might call forth their love. (He knew it would!)

5 Again, he had no personal animus against the offender. So let the minority, who out of a mistaken loyalty to him were continuing to treat the unhappy man unlovingly, alter their demeanor.[27]

12 "But (to return to my pain) when it was time for me to expect Titus with the answer, and I had gone down to Troas on missionary work and did not find him there, I simply could not keep on working — though I was meeting with great response—but said farewell to them and went on into Macedonia. With what result! My anguish proved to be part of God's triumph! Yes, that is the effect of our pain: more knowledge of Him everywhere. These sufferings are a sweet smell rising, giving to some indeed death and more death, but to some (you particularly) life and more life. Now no *man* can do that: it can come only to one whom God uses. And we let God use us so; for we are not as the many, huckstering the Word of God, but we speak from sincerity, as from God, in the face of God, in Christ."

Here he strikes again. *My* sincerity — *their* dishonesty. *My real power* by God everywhere to give life through my own humiliation.

Chap. 3 v. 1 Their very interposition of touchy criticism he turns now into a telling point. " 'Self-commendation,' you say. No, not for *me* with *you*. Some *need* letters to tell you how fine they are and ask letters

[27] With some hesitation I adopt the view of Professor Lake that the "you" is addressed to such a minority in contrast with "the majority" ("the more": R. V. margin).

from you to others. I simply point to you. Our epistle *you* are, written in our hearts" (notice he does not say *their* hearts).

4 He comes now to the test of fruit. What a mighty epistle, much mightier than any penned by man, mightier even than the ancient God-writing of the Law on the stone tables! "See now what we have done for you — though not we. Confidence! To be sure we have it — through Christ to God! Glory! O, it is here, more glory than Sinai! And boldness of speech! Of course we use it, as Moses could not. Christ means — seeing the truth unveiled — liberty — glory unto glory!

Chap. 4 v. 1 "Why should we show the white feather or fail to speak out? No! subterfuges are for the others who seek their own advantage. All we have to do is to tell the truth and let men judge for themselves.

3 " 'Some' do not think much of us or of our message. Well, there is a reason for that. They do not want Jesus Christ. The god of this world has blinded them with self-interest so that they do not *believe* in Jesus nor perceive the glory of God. They are not scorning us, but Jesus; for we preach not ourselves but Him as Lord and ourselves your servants (we do not 'bring you into bondage[28]) —for Jesus' sake.

7 "But I admit we have this treasure in earthen vessels. Don't you see the reason for that? You look at the vessel, the Paul after the flesh. You see a sick man with none of the outward marks of success and prosperity and health, not at all impressive, sick, turned over by God to death. You do *not* see that

[28] Cf. 2 Cor. 11:20.

God somehow keeps this Paul going on, nor do you see his fruit (God's really, of course), *life in you.* But I, I have faith (unlike the 'unbelieving');[29] and I can perceive these things — your life and my life with you. (It is all for you, no barren grace to me merely!)

16 "Therefore of course we do not show the white feather! No, even the impending destruction of this outward Paul does not make me despond. Why should it? The inward, eternal, heavenly Paul is made new day by day. This momentary 'lightness' of the affliction (the only thing *they* can notice) is really working for us more and more abundantly an
Chap. 5 eternal 'weight' of glory. No, in face of death we are
v. 1 of good courage. We groan, but in assured expectation. Yes, we approve it — would rather be at home with the Lord.

9 "Therefore we look to Him — not to men. We want to please Him always. For we shall all be manifested as we really are before His judgment seat, to receive what has been wrought for us through the body, as we have done, good things or poor." (He is leading up to the spiritual needs of his readers, and suddenly strikes the note of *fear*).

11 "Knowing then (as some do not seem to know) the fear of the Lord, *men* He pursuade, but to *God* we have been made manifest. (At the same time, I hope, to your consciences also). No, our pursuasiveness is not due to self-seeking but to fear for men. We are not, as some think 'beside ourselves,' obsessed with self-exhilaration (we only are helping you by

[29] 2 Cor. 4:4, 6:14.

putting the true words of praise in your mouth). If we are so 'obsessed,' let God take care of that! Do *you* ask only if we are perfectly sensible in the advice we give you. And we are.

14 "For we have come to this conclusion: that Jesus' loving death for *all*, followed by His resurrection, has made binding upon all the death to the old selfish, outward way of living and the resurrection to the new life of unselfish devotion to Him. So that *we* (whatever others may do) no longer pay any attention to the outward show presented by any man, even Jesus. (He was weak, but that concerns us not now.) We look at the inward man and expect to see there a new creation—from God.

18 "Now God (first) reconciled *us* (apostles) to Himself, then gave us the ministry of reconciliation" . . . . (So, having aroused fear and spoken of forgiveness, he then turns to the climax of appeal)—

20 "God through us says: 'Be reconciled! Avail yourselves of forgiveness.' And we, working with God, do also urge you that you receive not the grace of God in vain. Come back to Him now!

Chap. 6 v. 3 "That is why we give no offence in anything — that we may not get in the way of this service to *you*. That is why we 'commend ourselves' in everything; yes in all these traits that in spite of lack of impressiveness *do* yet commend us to every man's conscience in the sight of God. It is for *you* — do you not see!

11 "O yes, we love you! No lack of love on our part —the lack is on yours! Return our love by enlarging yours.

14 "Come! Break off with those who have no faith. You are holy, by God's invitation. 'Come ye out from among them,' says God, 'touch them not, they are unclean! And I will receive you!' Having these promises, dear, dear friends, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilements of flesh and spirit and make perfect holiness in the fear of God."

("We" — he no longer dissociates himself from them. As he will presently say, for good or ill he and they are united.)

Chap. 7 v. 1 "Having cast away the alien yoke of the unbelieving, make room for us beside you. You have nothing against us!

3 "Don't think I am saying all this to condemn you (though it sounds so). I am not your judge—I am one of you—yes, I said you are in our hearts, for dying together and for living together. We share all this wonderful grace, not one without the other!

4 "O, our union in this gives me boldness of speech, great boasting on behalf of you. I am filled with comfort. I overflow with joy in all our affliction!

5 "And that same anguish you caused me in the past proved this—for in the midst of it Titus comes to comfort me. And *he* also was made happy by you (as I told him he would be) : he remembers now your obedience, fear, trembling. Yes, the whole-hearted way in which you acted then—how can it but give me good courage concerning you now!"

This allusion to Titus leads up very tactfully to the business on which he is now being sent. Titus is coming (St. Paul suggests), not so much because their failure in the matter of the bounty makes it necessary (which is the plain truth), but mainly be-

cause he longs to see them again. "He is so confident—as I also am—that you will receive him with loyal zeal!"

Chap. 8 v. 1 "Now about the bounty. I want to tell you that the Macedonians have been blessed with a wonderful spirit of liberality. They are having a hard time of it (like you):[30] they are terribly poor (you say you 'have' so little);[30] but that only made them the more generous. *They* did not wait to be asked: they forced us to take it! Yes, more than they could afford. And they went even beyond our hopes, for not stopping at money they first gave *themselves* to the Lord and to us. (O, if you would also.)"

St. Paul is treading on very thin ice. He must bring home to the Corinthians their miserable failure, their stinginess[31] palliated by unworthy excuses: he must explode these excuses and urge immediate improvement, the time being short; and yet he must avoid angering them by over-bluntness. The tact and skill with which he contrives to say several exceedingly unpalatable things with the minimum of offence is marvellous. But for all that, nothing can gloss over the ugly facts. The glowing picture he paints in closing chapter 9 is all on the canvas of the future: the present is quite different! This is perhaps as good an instance as any of the "confidence" he keeps asserting towards the Corinthians. It is built up out of past and future, the material fur-

---

[30] The Corinthians seem to have been grumbling that their giving would mean "distress," and that they "had not"—2 Cor. 8:13, 14. In 2 Cor. 1:6 St. Paul speaks of their "sufferings," but only in passing.

[31] 2 Cor. 9:5—"covetousness"—v. 7 "grudgingly." We may be sure he is aiming at their faults, not speaking generally.

nished by the present coming almost entirely from St. Paul's own breast.

The course of thought in these two chapters needs no further elucidation.

Chap. 10 v. 1 "But—to return to the fundamental matter before us, this question of 'giving yourselves to the Lord and to us'—I plead with you, don't *you* depend, as 'some' do, upon finding me 'abased' when I come. These interlopers calculate only on the outward Paul: they forget that if it comes to a fight they will have a very different Paul to meet: a Paul armed with God's power to hurl down 'strongholds' and 'calculations' and every 'high' thing that is lifted up against (not me but) the knowledge of God: a Paul who can make a prisoner of every thought and compel it to obey Christ: a Paul ready to use God's power to work vengeance on all disobedience, when *your* obedience shall be brought up to the standard. (It is so imperfect now that I hold back for fear of involving you also in the destruction. That is why I am warning you now.")

In all that follows St. Paul will make no effort to convert his opponents, the "super-apostles" from outside. Evidently *they* are past influencing—men "without faith," "blinded," "perishing." His whole concern is to uncover their fraud before the Corinthians so plainly, and to make his own genuineness so evident in contrast, that these will "come out from among them" and "make room for him" in their hearts. In chapters 1-7 the interlopers were left to one side: it was "we" and "you" — St. Paul with arms open towards the Corinthians, looking away

from his opponents. Now, having won all who can be won by affectionate pleading he wheels about to face his enemies, and all who among the Corinthians adhere to them, whether more or less: particularly "those who have sinned hertofore and repented not," but also "all the rest," whomever the shoe fits.[32] Now it is to be "I" and "they" (the interlopers). But he still addresses the Corinthians over the heads of his opponents.

7 "Look at the plain facts—the 'things before your face'! One claims to be 'Christ's,' meaning that *I* am not. Let him go over that calculation again and his own mind will tell him that we are Christ's just as much as he. Authority? We have plenty of it and will prove it. (The only reason we have held back hitherto is our unwillingness to hurl you down: how will *that* help Christ?)

9 "I recall this to you lest you fall in with their sneer that we are bold only from a distance—in letters: you will find the contrary when we come—in what we *do*. Not in talk (they say we can't *talk!*). No, we shrink from such talk as theirs—coming into another man's work already done and boasting as if it were theirs! Our work 'talks' for us. Under God we made you Christians, before any other 'apostle' came on the field; and what we hope for is (not to be 'magnified' in a worldly sense because of our success with you but) to be 'magnified' in usefulness, to go one from you to make other new Christians. That is why we want you first to become better Christians that we may get a start from you in this new work.

[32] 2 Cor. 12:21, 13:2.

17 "Remember, in all this boasting you hear, that he is the real apostle who can boast of what the Lord has done through him—his work. For only he whom the Lord stamps with fruitfulness is real. Self-commendation is easy!

Chap. 11 v. 1 "I wish you would endure from me a little of this 'obsession' of self-appreciation — well, anyhow, do endure it. For in it I am not seeking my own reputation, I want to bring *you* back to Christ. (This dallying of yours with spurious 'apostles' means disloyalty to Christ!) They say I cannot give you what they can—I am not up to it. Well, what do they offer that you have not already got from us: another Jesus, gospel, Spirit? No. Never mind about my alleged inferiority in discourse. Did we not show in every possible way that we knew the truth and could teach it?

7 "Or perhaps your complaint is that I was not a real apostle to you because I did not take pay! Well, I did not, nor do I intend to. Not because I do not love you: God knows I do. But simply because I am determined to keep everlastingly before you (you need it) the fact that *these spurious 'apostles' are not like us.* They would love to get a handle against us; and if we took pay they would say: 'See, Paul is after money!' So the fact would be obscured (for you would listen to them!) that *they are not like us.* For they are false prophets, deceitful workers. They bear evil fruit; and—evil works, evil end.

16 "Yes, I am going to descend to the level of these men and, forgetting for the moment my Christian principles, I am going to compete with them in this 'obsession' of self-praise. You who are above all 'ob-

sessions' are glad to tolerate this sort of talk: to judge at least from the way you let them treat you! My words sound as if I admitted the disparagement of *our* being weak. But when it comes to boldness in making claims for self, I am as bold as any. (Remember, I am speaking from the level of 'obsession.') Like them I am a Hebrew, an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham. As to being a minister of Christ, I far outstrip them. But the grounds of my superiority are not superficial, showy gifts (things according to the flesh). On the contrary, if I must needs glory I shall at least remain true to my own standards and glory in the things they despise, the exhibitions of my 'weakness.' Yes, I will tell the most contemptible experience of my career, my escape by the Damascus wall. They cannot compete with me in *these* things.

Chap. 12 v. 1 "The logic of this unseemly glorying brings me to visions and revelations received from the Lord. Well, I could tell of a man who had a vision past telling! It would be the truth, but I refrain, lest anyone's estimate of me be based on aught but the facts that are evident to all: not on my assertion that I have had revelations far and away greater than others have enjoyed.

7 "For that very reason—lest I be lifted up—a sickness was given me. To my thrice repeated prayer that it depart the Lord replied: 'Sufficient for thee is my grace: for my power in weakness is made perfect.' That is why, instead of rebelling against my weaknesses I most gladly glory in them, that the power of Christ may pitch its tent over me. Wherefore I accept and welcome all these things that keep

me down, if they come for Christ's sake; for when I am weak then I am powerful!

11 "There! I have become 'obsessed'; but it was your fault. Why did you not say it for me? You know what I did for *you.* Wherein did I give you less than I gave the other churches—unless you hold against me my self-support!

14 "Look! I am now ready for the third time to come to you. I will show you by glad self-spending that I love you more than they: shall I therefore *be* loved less than they?

16 " 'Quite so' (some one says). 'He did not burden you; but that was only a blind.' Have I taken advantage of you by anyone else? No, there is no truth in that, and you know it!

19 "Have you been imagining all this while that we have been making a defence to *you?* This is no apologia—it is God's truth. But I *have* said everything, beloved, with the purpose of building you up (for you need it). I am afraid that when I come it will not be happy for either side. Then will I indeed be a 'humbled' before you at God's hands. (Not humbled in that some will set *me* at nought.) No, I will be a mourner, not for my authority slighted, but too well enforced!—to the hurling down of many among you who have never really repented.

Chap. 13 v. 1 "This third time I come I am going into everything thoroughly with witnesses. I repeat my warning already given beforehand, that if I come again I will not spare! You want a proof, do you, that I am a real apostle of Christ and that He speaks through me? Well, Christ towards you is not weak,

but He is powerful in you; because though, in the time of His flesh, He was crucified through weakness, that is past: *now* He is alive by virtue of the power of God. In the same way *we* are weak—with Him — partakers of His sufferings — but you will find that we shall live with Him by virtue of the power of God towards you.

5 "Try yourselves, whether you are in the faith; prove yourselves. (That will show you the power of Christ in you and what you may expect of it!) Or don't you know as to your own selves that Jesus Christ is in you? Unless, indeed, you are not real Christians. But I hope you will konw (when we come) that *we* are not spurious (at any rate)!

7 "But it is not our concern that *we* appear real at your expense. Never mind about us. We want you to do right, we pray that you will do nothing bad. And if that takes away the occasion of our enforcing our authority and proving ourselves real by hurling you down—why, we are content under those happy circumstances to seem like spurious apostles. For our power cannot be used against the truth, only for the truth. And we are glad when you are on the side of the truth and we need do nothing against you; yes, we are glad when we are weak but you are powerful! And that is what we pray for—your being made complete. And that is why I am writing this before I come; that when I come I may not have to show you my authority by severe handling. What good will that do Christ?

11 "For the rest, brothers, farewell! *Be* made complete; take admonition; be of the same mind; live in peace; and the God of peace will be with you . . ."

The Value of the Epistle for the Present Day.

This epistle is full of all sorts of values, but two seem to stand out specially.

1. *It brings home to us the true standard for estimating the Christian minister.* And note, it is written primarily for the congregation, for "the pew," as we should say. These Corinthians were prizing the spurious minister and slighting the genuine. Now that is a serious matter wherever it occurs; for after all, unless the rank and file of Christians can appreciate the true religious leader, they will tend to eliminate him by neglect and to encourage the other sort, to their own disaster. Who will deny that many Christians are today doing just this? Eloquence, organizing ability, "personality" and that convincing thing called "success" will cause a certain minister to "draw." Whether he himself is worthy of his popularity or more or less unworthy, the damage is done when his admirers seek him for inferior motives. The injury is to be found in *their* hearts.

St. Paul in this epistle asks the reader bluntly what he wants in his minister? "Appearance"? To be played upon by eloquence, to be impressed, to have the crowd with you in following after him? Worse still, is it possible that you like him because he condones, even encourages you in lesser ideals and inferior conduct?

Or do you want through him to receive Jesus Christ and the power of the Spirit—to be "built up" in character and usefulness for earthly service and immortal destiny?

It need not be added that to the minister himself these same questions are searching, yes, terrible. Yet when applied honestly to his own work they bring—along with the sense of unworthiness and insufficiency—a confidence and

liberty and dignity more valuable than any rewards of worldly popularity.

It is an hour when Christ needs — if ever He needed them — ministers who are real. No others endure the fiery trial of this time. The pew must demand them: the clergy must enforce the demand upon themselves. And in this both people and clergy will do well to read and reread Second Corinthians.

2. *The epistle furnishes a philosophy of the unescapable limitations of life.* St. Paul learned a deep lesson regarding those curtailings of efficiency and success that come from what he calls "weaknesses." To the Corinthians (being Greeks) the word "astheneia" had at once a general and a special significance. In general it denoted any sort of powerlessness: in particular it was the common term for illness. St. Paul was "weak" in both these senses.

He tells us that at first he did not accept his illness, but did his best to be freed from it through prayer. Instead, he was given a philosophy that led him to "approve" it enthusiastically. It will be easily seen that this is a very different philosophy from that of "perfect God" "demonstrating" Himself in "perfect body" or any other perfection "according to the flesh," such as prosperity, wealth and success.

It is a philosophy, as I say, for the *unescapable* limitations of life. St. Paul did not "approve" his illness until he had exhausted all the resources of prayer for its removal. He believed in the "ministry of healing." Christian people who do not use God with might and main to be rid of sickness are denying the faith. And so with the other "weaknesses," such as want and failure and manifold unhappiness, that clog the stream of life. Most of these should not be submitted to as "God's will," but overcome through

prayer and waiting upon the Lord. The daily walk of Christ's follower ought to be much more victorious over outward limitations than the present littleness of faith allows it to be.

But there do come troubles that refuse to yield to all our faith and defeats that the most heroic prayer does not ward off. What shall we say to these? Shall we look upon them as sheer loss, due only to our lack of belief? Shall we say, God willed our victory, but *we failed* to realize his will? I think not. It were better, it seems to me, to turn then to Second Corinthians and learn there how Christ showed St. Paul that his apparent failure meant not failure at all, but a deeper, richer success.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Conduct of Public Worship. By the Rev. F. H. J. Newton. Longmans, Green & Co.

In these days we are reminded often of the need for proper rendering of the Offices of the Church. Sometimes the admonition is mainly bitter and destructive, a voice from one who is conscious of being disappointed and deprived but is incompetent to suggest any remedy. This is the character of nearly all volunteer criticism of Public Worship. It is stimulating but inadequate. Where, however, a competent critic speaks we do well to listen and ponder.

Such a helpful monitor is Mr. Newton. As chaplain to the Bishop and curate in the Cathedral of St. Albans, he has had abundant opportunity, we may be sure, to note infelicities and incompetences in the conduct of the Services. His book has the great value which comes from keen and kindly observation. It is a fruit of experience and the flavor is human and tonic. Five chapters are occupied with clear teaching of fundamentals, of voice, articulation, enunciation, phrasing and emphasis; the rest of the book, with particular comments on the rendering of Prayer Book Offices and a valuable chapter on Preaching.

It is hard to conceive of the necessity of some of the criticisms; such slovenly and unintelligent reading as they describe is seldom heard in this church. Most of the instances pilloried are, however, familiar, generically if not identically. There is too much truth for comfort in the sharp comment, in regard to the reading of Lessons, "the prevailing tendency is to be unspeakably dull." The apparent lack of spiritual reality in the prayers is described in this biting sentence: "Often the prayers are uttered as if they were being reproduced by a gramophone with a faulty record."

In general the suggestions about emphasis are rational and many of them are greatly needed. The treatment of a current habit of putting undue stress on pronouns and prepositions reminds one of Bishop Creighton's radical saying: "Never emphasize a pronoun." While there are exceptions to this good rule, as Mr. Newton knows and says, it would be far better for everyone to keep it rigidly than for so many to offend by

gratuitous folly in emphasizing wrongly and too often. Mr. Newton properly sends readers to their Greek Testaments, if they are in doubt as to the propriety of putting stress on a pronoun. It is odd, however, that while he rightly instances the emphatic "I" in our Lord's great promise, "I will give you rest," he quite ignores the opposite testimony of the Greek form of the pronoun in the invitation, "Come unto me." Similarly, in the Litany, to say, "Son of God, we beseech *Thee* to hear us," obscures the comforting truth that for several minutes we have been offering our prayers to our Blessed Lord.

The concluding section on Preaching is crowded with practical, helpful thoughts in regard both to the matter and the manner of sermons. For a wonder, this teaching is put compactly, in twenty-eight short paragraphs. A few samples will indicate their suggestive value: God's Word should light up the problems and difficulties of *today*. Don't drag in too many of the catch phrases of the day. Keep clear of ecclesiastical jargon. Speak to the simplest of us. Don't try to be impressive.

This book deserves to be pondered. There is probably no one who officiates in public who cannot be helped by some of its suggestions. To help one who leads the worship of the congregation is to improve the worship, to make it more useful to men, more worthy of being offered to God. H. M. Denslow.

Lay Religion. By Henry T. Hodgkin, M.A. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1919.

Is the World Growing Better? By James H. Snowden, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburg. New York, the Macmillan Co., 1919.

Both of these books are examples, and very fair examples, of the sort of thing that many people are writing and apparently for many readers. They are discussions of current religious problems, professedly in the light of the great experience of the war. Whatever incidental value and inspiration (and there is much) pages here and there may have, it is difficult for a Churchman to derive the advantage of it, for they begin by sweeping aside, by the exercise of infallible private judgment, most of the fundamental principles upon which his religion and practice are based. For us they simply and absolutely miss fire. L. G.

Tekel: The Papacy and the War. By Arthur C. Champneys, M.A. G. Bell & Sons, Ltd., London, 1919.

The writer of this little pamphlet had a promising theme and abundant material, of which however he does not seem to have made very much. This is largely due to his style, which is diffuse; and to his method, which is not systematic. If he had arranged his material as the expansion of a brief, for he is arguing a case, he would have carried conviction; for actually the evidence that he scatters through his pamphlet rather haphazardly really proves his points. Unfortunately he is apt but to confirm a casual reader in a vague impression that his previous vague impression as to the Pope's dubious diplomacy during the war was justified.—L. G.

The American Cathedral. By the Rt. Rev. William Lawrence, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Massachusetts. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1919.

In this little book, not longer than a magazine article, Bishop Lawrence states clearly, succinctly, and persuasively the advantages and the ideals that should underlay the development of the cathedral in the American Church. It is, moreover, the voice of experience, for certainly with meagre equipment and in the face of many obstacles, Bishop Lawrence's own cathedral has come to play a cathedral's part in the religious life of the city. It should be read by everyone interested in the cathedral idea.

L. G.

Broad Church Theology, Its Limitations and Defects. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. London, Rob't Scott; Milwaukee, Morehouse Publishing Co., 1919; pp. xiv + 130.

This is one of the series, Handbooks of Catholic Faith and Practice. In a short introduction the author gives a few sample quotations from writers of the Broad Church School, showing the trend of their thought on certain of the articles of the faith which are particularly unpalatable to modernists. He explains the difficulty of dealing with a school as such when its foundation is individual independence and its product is diversity. One knows before asking what a Catholic believes. The old-fashioned Evangelicals stood for something quite definite in theology. But a Broad Church creed would be very difficult to write.

The subjects dealt with by this author indicate his estimate of where the chief troubles arise. In his eleven chapters he treats: the cognosci-

bility of God; the difficulties involved in ascribing personality to God; modern heresies regarding the Holy Trinity; and modern "restatements" of Christology. The modernist deprecates, almost to the point of agnosticism, theology's penetration of God's nature. He is reluctant to call Him a person, as in some way belittling God. He goes back to the early heresies on the Holy Trinity and declares for three characters in one Person instead of three Persons in one God. And above all the modernist balks at the plain, bald assertion of the proper deity of our Lord,—like Arius, glossing over his denial with glowing words on the uniqueness and the example of Jesus.

This is a very useful little book. The author might have said more about the "broad" conception of the church. For nearly all the heresies and difficulties of the "modern churchman" go back to that, and would vanish if he could understand and accept the catholic doctrine of the Spirit-guided church, which can be trusted to teach men what to believe and to do that their souls may be saved. If the catholic doctrine of the church is true the creeds are true, permanently. If the catholic doctrine of the church is false then the Broad Church veneration for the creeds as "historical documents" is rather sentimental. H. K. P.

I Believe in God the Father. By John Faville, D.D., Ph.D. Boston, The Stratford Company, 1919.

This book is an earnest essay in popularly worded theology, by a Congregational minister. In these Concordat days we should be interested in Congregational theology,—in the writings of those whom presently we may be asked to ordain to the priesthood. This author claims that he has discovered the religion which Jesus really taught and which the Christian Church, beginning with St. Paul and all down through history, has misunderstood and misrepresented. The essence of this, the true religion, is God's fatherhood, and its creed is the sentence which forms the book's title. It appears that till now Christians have been all wrong, because they have placed God's sovereignty first. The author, if he believes in God's sovereignty and other attributes, considers them of no importance. "Metaphysical speculations" on such matters do not appeal to him. He treats our Lord as an unique figure, but not as more than man.—H. K. P.

The Holy Eucharist

By the Rev. J. G. H. BARRY, D.D.

Dr. Barry's latest volume supplies the long-felt want of a book on the devotional side of the Eucharist. Taking for granted the Catholic teaching on the Eucharist, the author develops the practical out-working of the doctrine, especially in our devotional life. He sketches graphically the development of devotional practices. He gives valuable practical hints for self-examination in preparation for Communion, e. g., insisting that the Christian should inquire carefully into his progress in spiritual growth. He shows us the practical outcome of the doctrine of the Real Presence, in the indwelling of the divine Guest in the soul of the communicant. He insists on frequent Communions, daily if possible, because of our desire for them, rooted in our love for Jesus Christ. And, further, the Communion is not only with Christ, but with one another, the manifestation of our brotherhood. The relation between the Communion and the Resurrection of the body is brought out. The final practical result is the Thanksgiving, with all it implies, and the Visit to the Blessed Sacrament. The book is vital with spiritual truth and intensely practical.

THE PUBLISHER.

Twentieth Thousand

The Healing of Christ In His Church

54 pages, $.50

✢

The Revival of the Gift of Healing

30 Pages, $.15

By JAMES MOORE HICKSON

"He is a remarkable man, and the deep spiritual message which he brings of the power of the Living Christ to energize man's soul and give wholeness and tranquility and power to his life, is one of the startling phenomena of the life of the Episcopal Church in our time." — *The Churchman*, August 2, 1919.

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Publisher

11 West 45th Street
NEW YORK